arXiv:1410.4676v1 [math.PR] 17 Oct 2014

CONFORMAL SYMMETRIES IN THE EXTREMAL PROCESS OF TWO-DIMENSIONAL DISCRETE GAUSSIAN FREE FIELD

MAREK BISKUP AND OREN LOUIDOR

Department of Mathematics, UCLA, Los Angeles, California, USA
Faculty of Industrial Engineering and Management, Technion, Haifa, Israel

Abstract: We study the extremal process associated with the Discrete Gaussian Free Field on the square lattice and show how the conformal symmetries manifest themselves in the scaling limit. Specifically, we prove that the joint process of spatial positions (x) and centered values (h) of the extreme local maxima in lattice versions of a bounded domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ converges, as the lattice spacing tends to zero, to a Poisson point process with intensity measure $Z^D(\mathrm{d}x) \otimes \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha h}\mathrm{d}h$, where α is a constant derived from overall normalization of the field and Z^D is a random a.s.-finite measure on D. The laws of the measures $\{Z^D\}$ are naturally interrelated; restrictions to subdomains are governed by a Gibbs-Markov property and images under analytic bijections f by the transformation rule $(Z^{f(D)} \circ f)(\mathrm{d}x) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} |f'(x)|^4 Z^D(\mathrm{d}x)$. Conditions are also given that determine the laws of these measures uniquely. All but one of these are known to hold for the critical Liouville Quantum Gravity measure associated with the Continuum Gaussian Free Field.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Discrete Gaussian Free Field (DGFF) is a Gaussian process $\{h_x^V : x \in V\}$, indexed by the vertices in a finite subset V of an infinite graph, say $\mathbb{Z}^d$, with covariance given by the Green function, i.e., the expected number $G_V(x,y)$ of visits to y of the simple random walk started from x and killed upon exiting V. We usually take the field to be zero mean, $Eh_x^V = 0$, and regard it to be identically zero outside V. The law of the DGFF can alternatively be prescribed by normalizing the measure

$$\exp\Bigl\{-\frac{1}{4d}\sum_{\langle x,y\rangle}(h_x-h_y)^2\Bigr\}\prod_{x\in V}\mathrm{d}h_x, \tag{1.1}$$

where the sum goes over all unordered nearest-neighbor pairs with at least one vertex in V and the values outside V are set implicitly to zero. As is easy to see, if V has several connected components, then the fields in these components are independent of each other.

The DGFF has been a subject of rather intense research over the past years. Indeed, it arises naturally as an effective interface model, and thus provides a background for studying various pinning, wetting and entropic-repulsion phenomena. The DGFF also appears as a model of crystal deformations, fluctuations in interacting spin systems and as a simple (non-interacting) field theory. Thanks to the Dynkin isomorphism (Dynkin [26]), the DGFF plays an important role in the study of occupation time measures for Markov chains (Dembo, Peres, Rosen and Zeitouni [19], Ding, Lee and Peres [22], Ding [21]) and thus has a bearing on random interlacements and loop decompositions (e.g., Sznitman [38], Le Jan [32]).

© 2014 M. Biskup, O. Louidor. Reproduction, by any means, of the entire article for non-commercial purposes is permitted without charge.

The two-dimensional DGFF, i.e., the case of $d = 2$ above, has been of particular interest thanks to its connection to critical behavior in various models in equilibrium statistical mechanics. This usually comes through its continuum counterpart, the Continuum Gaussian Free Field (CGFF), that arises in the limit as the mesh size of the underlying lattice tends to zero. The CGFF is a somewhat unwieldy object as it does not exist as a proper random function. Nonetheless, it can still be defined directly as a Gaussian random linear functional over the space of functions on domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ endowed with the Dirichlet inner product

$$(f,g)_\nabla := \frac{1}{4}\int_D \nabla f(x)\cdot\nabla g(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \tag{1.2}$$

see, e.g., the review by Sheffield [37]. A distinguished feature of the two-dimensional CGFF is that it is invariant, in a properly defined sense, under conformal maps (i.e., analytic bijections) of the underlying domain.

Among the most heavily researched questions about the two-dimensional DGFF is the limit law of the absolute maximum. Thanks to the work of Bolthausen, Deuschel and Giacomin [11], Bolthausen, Deuschel and Zeitouni [12], Bramson and Zeitouni [17] and Bramson, Ding and Zeitouni [16], the centered maximum of the DGFF in a box $V_N := (0,N)^2 \cap \mathbb{Z}^2$ of side N,

$$\max_{x\in V_N} h_x^{V_N} - m_N, \tag{1.3}$$

with the centering sequence given by

$$m_N := 2\sqrt{g}\log N - \frac{3}{4}\sqrt{g}\log\log N, \tag{1.4}$$

is known to admit a non-degenerate distributional limit as $N\to\infty$. Here $g := 2/\pi$ denotes the constant that captures the leading-order logarithmic growth of the diagonal (discrete) Green function $G_{V_N}(x,x) = g\log N + O(1)$ as soon as x are sufficiently away from V_N^{c}.

In [9], the present authors moved to a description of the extreme order statistics. In particular, they managed to characterize the joint limiting point process of scaled spatial positions (labeled by x in the limit) and centered values (labelled by h) of all nearly-maximal local maxima in V_N. This process turns out to be a Cox process of the form

$$\mathrm{PPP}\bigl(Z(\mathrm{d}x)\otimes \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha h}\mathrm{d}h\bigr), \tag{1.5}$$

where "PPP" stands for a Poisson point process, $Z(\mathrm{d}x)$ is a *random* intensity measure on $[0,1]^2$ and $\alpha := 2/\sqrt{g} = \sqrt{2\pi}$. In particular, the asymptotic law of the centered maximum (1.3) was linked via

$$P\bigl(\max_{x\in V_N} h_x^{V_N} - m_N \le t\bigr) \underset{N\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} E\bigl(\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha^{-1}\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha t}Z}\bigr) \tag{1.6}$$

to the Laplace transform of the total mass $Z := Z([0,1]^2)$ of $Z(\mathrm{d}x)$.

The extreme points of the DGFF thus behave in remarkable analogy with those of the Branching Brownian Motion where convergence of the maximum goes back to Bramson [14,15], (1.6) is a classic result of McKean [34] and Lalley and Sellke [29] and the Poisson nature of the limit process is due to recent work of Arguin, Bovier and Kistler [4–6] and Aïdekon, Berestycki, Brunet and Shi [2]. Bovier [13] gives a nice recent review of these developments.

There are two directions in which the work [9] calls for a further extension. The first one concerns the behavior of the full extremal process; indeed, the results of [9] addressed only extreme local maxima and ignored, for good reasons, the points (still extremal) lying nearby

thereof. The second direction concerns the structure of the random measure $Z(\mathrm{d}x)$. Here we will focus on the latter leaving the former to a subsequent publication (Biskup and Louidor [10]). Two natural questions arise:

(1) How does (and does it at all) the conformal invariance of the CGFF manifest itself in the limit law of the extremal process?
(2) Can the law of the Z-measure be independently characterized? In particular, what properties determine the law uniquely?

We note that, for question (1), there is no *a priori* reason why conformal invariance of the CGFF should be relevant; indeed, there is no meaning to the value of the CGFF at a point and so it makes no sense to talk about its maximum. For question (2) we note that the proof of the asymptotic law (1.5) in [9] is based on a distributional invariance that gives no further qualification of the spatial part of the intensity measure. Notwithstanding, a conjectural relation to the so called *derivative martingale* associated with the CGFF was proposed in Duplantier, Rhodes, Sheffield and Vargas [24, 25]. A version of this relation was shown to hold in Theorem 1.4 of Biskup and Louidor [9] for the measure arising in (1.5).

2. Main results

2.1 Limit in general domains.

We now move to the statement of our main results. Our first goal is to generalize the main conclusion of Biskup and Louidor [9] — namely, the convergence to the Cox process (1.5) — from square boxes to a representative family of domains in the complex plane. We will take this family to be the class $\mathfrak{D}$ of all non-empty, bounded, open sets $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ with a finite number of connected components and boundary ∂D that has a finite number of connected components each of which is of a positive Euclidean diameter. Note that $\mathfrak{D}$ is closed under shifts, rotations, dilations and finite unions and that it includes all bounded simply connected domains in $\mathbb{C}$.

Let $\mathrm{d}(x,y)$ denote the Euclidean distance in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Given $D \in \mathfrak{D}$ we then consider a family $\{D_N : N \geq 1\}$ of its discrete approximations for which we assume

$$D_N \subseteq \bigl\{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \mathrm{d}(x/N, D^{\mathrm{c}}) > 1/N\bigr\}, \tag{2.1}$$

and, for each $\delta > 0$ and N sufficiently large, also

$$D_N \supseteq \bigl\{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \mathrm{d}(x/N, D^{\mathrm{c}}) > \delta\bigr\} \tag{2.2}$$

We will write $h_N^D(x)$ for $h_x^{D_N}$. The reason for requiring (2.1) is that, if D has connected components $D^1, \dots, D^m$, then D_N^i and D_N^j for any $i \neq j$ are at least two lattice steps apart and so the fields $(h_N^{D^1}, \dots, h_N^{D^m})$ are independent. See Fig. 1 for an illustration.

Associated with each sample of h_N^D is a point process of centered extreme local maxima. This process is realized as the random Borel measure on $\overline{D} \times \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\eta_{N,r}^D := \sum_{x \in D_N} 1_{\{h_N^D(x) = \max_{z \in \Lambda_r(x)} h_N^D(z)\}} \delta_{(x/N,\, h_N^D(x) - m_N)}, \tag{2.3}$$

where

$$\Lambda_r(x) := \{z \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : |z - x| \leq r\} \tag{2.4}$$



FIG 1. An illustration of a domain $D \in \mathfrak{D}$ (the region in the plane bounded by the solid curves) along with its discrete approximation D_N (the lattice vertices contained in the gray areas) corresponding to the set on the right of (2.1).

defines the meaning of "local," the centering sequence m_N is as in (1.4), 1_A is the indicator of event A and δ_z denotes the unit (Dirac) point-mass at z.

The family $\{\eta_{N,r}\}$ belongs to the space of locally-finite Borel measures on a locally compact metric space which, if endowed with vague topology, permits us to consider its distributional limit points. Let $\mathrm{Leb}(\cdot)$ denote the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^2$ and, given a sigma-finite Borel measure λ, let $\mathrm{PPP}(\lambda)$ denote the associated Poisson point process. If λ is itself random then the law of $\mathrm{PPP}(\lambda)$ is also averaged over the law of λ. The starting point of our derivations is:

Theorem 2.1 *For each $D \in \mathfrak{D}$ there is a non-zero random Borel measure $Z^D(\mathrm{d}x)$ on $\overline{D}$ with $Z^D(\overline{D}) < \infty$ a.s. such that for any r_N satisfying $r_N \to \infty$ and $r_N/N \to 0$, the point process η^D_{N,r_N}, regarded as a measure on Borel subsets of $\overline{D} \times \mathbb{R}$, obeys*

$$\eta^D_{N,r_N} \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{\text{law}} \mathrm{PPP}\bigl(Z^D(\mathrm{d}x) \otimes \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha h}\mathrm{d}h\bigr), \tag{2.5}$$

where $\alpha := 2/\sqrt{g}$. The measure Z^D has the following properties almost surely:

(1) *Z^D is non-atomic and $Z^D(\partial D) = 0$,*
(2) *$Z^D(A) > 0$ for any $A \subset D$ open and so $\operatorname{supp} Z^D = \overline{D}$.*

Moreover, Z^D is stochastically absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure in the sense that, for any Borel $A \subset \overline{D}$ with $\mathrm{Leb}(A) = 0$ we have $P(Z^D(A) > 0) = 0$. Finally, if D is the union of pairwise-disjoint sets $D_1, \dots, D_m \in \mathfrak{D}$, then

$$Z^D \overset{\text{law}}{=} Z^{D_1} + \cdots + Z^{D_m}, \tag{2.6}$$

where $Z^{D_1}, \dots, Z^{D_m}$ are independent and regarded as measures on D.

This result extends the main theorem of Biskup and Louidor [9] from square domains to all $D \in \mathfrak{D}$. Since Z^D puts zero mass on ∂D almost surely, we will regard it from now on as a measure on D only. As a consequence of the existence of the limit we get:

Corollary 2.2 (Shift and dilation invariance) *For $a \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\lambda > 0$, let us denote $a + \lambda D := \{a + \lambda z \colon z \in D\}$. For all $D \in \mathfrak{D}$, all $a \in \mathbb{C}$ and all $\lambda > 0$,*

$$Z^{a+\lambda D}(a + \lambda \mathrm{d}x) \overset{\text{law}}{=} \lambda^4 Z^D(\mathrm{d}x). \tag{2.7}$$

These properties will play an important role in the sequel.

2.2 Relations between Z-measures.

As was just noted in Corollary 2.2, the laws of random measures $\{Z^D \colon D \in \mathfrak{D}\}$ are quite interrelated. In this section, we will state two important relations that these laws satisfy but in order to do this, we will first need some more definitions.

For $D \in \mathfrak{D}$, let $\Pi^D(x, \mathrm{d}y)$ denote the Poisson kernel, i.e., the harmonic measure, in D relative to x. In probabilistic terms, this is the distribution of the first hitting point of ∂D by the Brownian motion started at x. Given $D, \widetilde{D} \in \mathfrak{D}$ subject to $\widetilde{D} \subseteq D$, let $C^{D,\widetilde{D}} \colon \widetilde{D} \times \widetilde{D} \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$C^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x,y) := g \int_{\partial D} \Pi^D(x, \mathrm{d}z) \log|z-y| - g \int_{\partial \widetilde{D}} \Pi^{\widetilde{D}}(x, \mathrm{d}z) \log|z-y|, \tag{2.8}$$

where g is as in, e.g., (1.4) above. We make a couple of observations:

Lemma 2.3 *The function $x, y \mapsto C^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x,y)$ is symmetric and positive definite on $\widetilde{D} \times \widetilde{D}$. It is also harmonic on $\widetilde{D}$ in each coordinate. Consequently, there is a centered Gaussian field $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ on $\widetilde{D}$ with covariance $C^{D,\widetilde{D}}$. The sample paths of this field are harmonic, and thus smooth, on $\widetilde{D}$, a.s.*

As is well known (and follows from (2.1)), the DGFF has the *Gibbs-Markov property*: given $U \subset V$, conditional on $\{h^V_x \colon x \in U\}$, the field in U is a sum of independent copies of h^U and a random Gaussian function which is a harmonic extension to U of the values of h^V in $V \setminus U$; see (3.2) for a precise formulation. This is reflected for measures Z^D as follows:

Theorem 2.4 (Gibbs-Markov property) *Let $D, \widetilde{D} \in \mathfrak{D}$ with $\widetilde{D} \subseteq D$ but $\mathrm{Leb}(D \setminus \widetilde{D}) = 0$. Then*

$$Z^D(\mathrm{d}x) \overset{\text{law}}{=} Z^{\widetilde{D}}(\mathrm{d}x)\, \mathrm{e}^{\alpha \Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)}, \tag{2.9}$$

where $Z^{\widetilde{D}}$ and $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ on the right are independent and (as before) $\alpha := 2/\sqrt{g}$. (The right-hand side (2.9) *is meaningful since $Z^{\widetilde{D}}$ (as well as Z^D) puts zero mass on $D \setminus \widetilde{D}$ a.s.)*

For the second relation that ties the Z^D-measures together, let us recall that the two-dimensional CGFF is, in a properly defined sense, conformally invariant. Although the maximum of CGFF is not meaningful, conformal invariance still reflects itself in the behavior of (the law of) Z^D under conformal transformations of D. This is the content of:

Theorem 2.5 (Conformal invariance) *Let $D \in \mathfrak{D}$ and let f be an analytic bijection of D onto $f(D) \in \mathfrak{D}$. The laws of Z^D and $Z^{f(D)}$ are then related by the transformation rule*

$$\left(Z^{f(D)} \circ f\right)(\mathrm{d}x) \overset{\text{law}}{=} |f'(x)|^4 Z^D(\mathrm{d}x). \tag{2.10}$$

In particular, for D simply connected, the law of the random measure

$$\mathrm{rad}_D(x)^{-4}\,Z^D(\mathrm{d}x), \tag{2.11}$$

where $\mathrm{rad}_D(x)$ *denotes the conformal radius of D at x, is invariant under conformal maps of D.*

Obviously, (2.10) vastly generalizes the statement in Corollary 2.2. Moreover, in combination with Theorem 2.1, one can regard (2.10–2.11) as a form of universality of the law of extreme local maxima with respect to changes in the underlying domain.

For the benefit of the reader we recall that (for simply connected D) the conformal radius $\mathrm{rad}_D(x)$ is the (unique) value of $|f'(x)|^{-1}$ for any conformal map $f\colon D\to\mathbb{D}$, where $\mathbb{D}$ denotes the unit disc $\mathbb{D}:=\{z\in\mathbb{C}\colon |z|<1\}$, such that $f(x)=0$. Interestingly, this notion is closely related to objects introduced earlier in this section (specifically, the kernel $C^{D,\widetilde{D}}$) via

$$\mathrm{rad}_D(x)=\exp\Bigl\{\int_{\partial D}\Pi^D(x,\mathrm{d}z)\log|z-x|\Bigr\}. \tag{2.12}$$

As is immediate from Theorem 2.5 and the Riemann Mapping Theorem, the conformal transformation rule (2.10) determines the law of Z^D from that of $Z^{\mathbb{D}}$ for any simply connected domain $D\in\mathfrak{D}$. The Gibbs-Markov property (2.9) and the stochastic absolute continuity with respect to the Lebesgue measure permit us to represent non-simply connected domains as restrictions, up to a set of vanishing Lebesgue measure, of simply connected ones. So, in fact, the law of $Z^{\mathbb{D}}$ determines the law of Z^D for all $D\in\mathfrak{D}$.

2.3 Tail behavior.

The conformal radius also shows up in the asymptotic law of the absolute maximum of the field conditioned to be very large. The precise statement is as follows:

Theorem 2.6 *Fix $D\in\mathfrak{D}$, recall that h_N^D denotes the DGFF in D_N defined in* (2.1) *and m_N denotes the centering sequence from* (1.4)*. Set, as before, $\alpha:=2/\sqrt{g}$. Then for all open $A\subseteq D$,*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{t}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha t}\,P\Bigl(N^{-1}\operatorname*{argmax}_{D_N}h_N^D\in A\,,\,\max_{x\in D_N}h_N^D>m_N+t\Bigr)=\int_A\psi^D(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \tag{2.13}$$

where

$$\psi^D(x):=C_\star\exp\Bigl\{2\int_{\partial D}\Pi^D(x,\mathrm{d}z)\log|z-x|\,\Bigr\} \tag{2.14}$$

for some positive constant $C_\star$ independent of D. In particular, for D simply connected we have $\psi^D(x)=C_\star\,\mathrm{rad}_D(x)^2$. In addition, if $D=D^1\cup\cdots\cup D^m$ with $D^1,\dots,D^m\in\mathfrak{D}$ pairwise disjoint, then $\psi^D=\psi^{D^i}$ on D^i for all $i=1,\dots,m$.

Theorem 2.6 generalizes Proposition 2.2 in Bramson, Ding and Zeitouni [16] where the limit (2.13) was shown to hold for square domains. Thus, our main contribution here is that we identify the limiting density ψ^D explicitly. (Incidentally, a formula linking ψ^D to $\mathrm{rad}_D(x)^2$ was surmised, on the basis of conjectured conformal transformation rule (2.10), already in [9].) Note that ψ^D is generally not a probability density, although $\int_D\psi^D(x)\mathrm{d}x<\infty$ since ψ^D is bounded. In fact, the value of $\int_D\psi^D(x)\mathrm{d}x$ captures the D-dependence of the asymptotic tail of $\max_{x\in D_N}h_N^D(x)-m_N$. The asymptotic (2.13) reads for the Z^D-measure as follows:

Corollary 2.7 *Given $D \in \mathfrak{D}$, define the random probability measure $\widehat{Z}^D(A) := Z^D(A)/Z^D(D)$. Then for any open set $A \subseteq D$,*

$$\lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{E\big(\widehat{Z}^D(A)\,(1-\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda Z^D(D)})\big)}{\lambda \log(1/\lambda)} = \int_A \psi^D(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \tag{2.15}$$

and, consequently,

$$\lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{E\big(Z^D(A)\,\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda Z^D(D)}\big)}{\log(1/\lambda)} = \int_A \psi^D(x)\,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{2.16}$$

These results will actually serve as an important ingredient for the proof of Theorem 2.5. Indeed, thanks to the explicit form (2.14) we readily check that $x \mapsto \psi^D(x)$ is invariant under simultaneous rotations of D and x — while, of course, keeping the underlying lattice in the same position. With the help of the Gibbs-Markov property, this readily yields *rotation invariance* of the law of the Z^D-measure (see Lemma 7.1 for a precise statement). In conjunction with Corollary 2.2, this is then further boosted to get the conformal-transformation rule (2.10). See Theorem 7.2 for an axiomatic formulation.

We note that (2.16) implies (2.15) via l'Hospital's Rule. With some extra work, these expressions also yield an asymptotic form for the Laplace transform of the integral of any continuous function $f\colon \overline{D} \to \mathbb{R}$ against $Z^D(\mathrm{d}x)$; see Proposition 6.6.

2.4 Conditions for uniqueness.

As our last item of concern, and as a response to question (2) from the introduction, we formulate conditions that identify the law of Z^D-measures uniquely. We give these in an axiomatic form:

Theorem 2.8 *Suppose $\{M^D\colon D \in \mathfrak{D}\}$ is a family of random Borel measures that obey:*

(0) *(support and total mass restriction) M^D is concentrated on D and $M^D(D) < \infty$ a.s.*

(1) *(stochastic absolute continuity) $P(M^D(A) > 0) = 0$ for any Borel $A \subset D$ with $\mathrm{Leb}(A) = 0$.*

(2) *(shift and dilation invariance) For any $a \in \mathbb{C}$ and any $\lambda > 0$,*

$$M^{a+\lambda D}(a + \lambda\,\mathrm{d}x) \overset{\text{law}}{=} \lambda^4 M^D(\mathrm{d}x). \tag{2.17}$$

(3) *(Gibbs-Markov property) If $D, \widetilde{D} \in \mathfrak{D}$ are disjoint then, for M^D and $M^{\widetilde{D}}$ on the right are regarded as independent,*

$$M^{D\cup\widetilde{D}}(\mathrm{d}x) \overset{\text{law}}{=} M^D(\mathrm{d}x) + M^{\widetilde{D}}(\mathrm{d}x). \tag{2.18}$$

If $D, \widetilde{D} \in \mathfrak{D}$ instead obey $\widetilde{D} \subseteq D$ and $\mathrm{Leb}(D \smallsetminus \widetilde{D}) = 0$, then (for $\alpha := 2/\sqrt{g}$)

$$M^D(\mathrm{d}x) \overset{\text{law}}{=} M^{\widetilde{D}}(\mathrm{d}x)\,\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)}, \tag{2.19}$$

where $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ is a centered Gaussian field with covariance $C^{D,\widetilde{D}}$, independent of $M^{\widetilde{D}}$.

(4) *(Laplace transform tail) For ψ^D as in* (2.14) *and any open $A \subseteq D$,*

$$\lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{E(M^D(A)\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda M^D(D)})}{\log(1/\lambda)} = \int_A \psi^D(x)\,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{2.20}$$

Then $M^D \overset{\text{law}}{=} Z^D$ for all $D \in \mathfrak{D}$.



FIG 2. A sample of the critical Liouville Quantum Gravity measure on a unit square.

The above was formulated with the aim to prove rigorously the conjecture that Z^D has the same law, up to an overall multiplicative constant, as the critical *Liouville Quantum Gravity*. This is a measure, constructed in Duplantier, Rhodes, Sheffield and Vargas [25] (see also [24]), given as a ψ^D-multiple of the so called *derivative martingale* on D which is itself obtained as the $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ (a.s.) limit of the measures

$$\widetilde{M}^D_\varepsilon(\mathrm{d}x) := 1_D(x)\bigl(\alpha\mathrm{Var}(\Phi_\varepsilon(x)) - \Phi_\varepsilon(x)\bigr)\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi_\varepsilon(x)-\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2\mathrm{Var}(\Phi_\varepsilon(x))}\mathrm{d}x, \tag{2.21}$$

for a family $\{\Phi_\varepsilon\}$ of suitable regularizations of the CGFF on D.

Unfortunately, for the regularizations given in [24,25], we have so far only succeeded checking conditions (0–3) but have been unable to verify condition (4). Notwithstanding, at least for the derivative martingale obtained from so called scale-invariant kernels (Barral, Kupiainen, Nikula, Saksman, Webb [8, Section 5]), there are estimates on the upper tail on measure in a unit box that are consistent with (2.20). Incidentally, for this case Madaule [33] already proved the connection between the asymptotic law of the maximum and the derivative martingale directly.

Also our proof of Theorem 2.8 is based on a derivative-martingale like representation of any family of measures $\{M^D\colon D \in \mathfrak{D}\}$ satisfying above properties; see Theorem 6.1. The explicit form of ψ^D and its relation to $C^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ play an important role there. (Note, however, that we do not require a full conformal transformation rule in (2), just shift and dilation invariance.)

2.5 Remarks.

We finish by some remarks concerning the above exposition.

(1) *Domain choices*: Our restriction to domains with a finite number of non-degenerate boundary components comes from the requirements on convergence of the harmonic measure in discrete

and continuum approximations thereof (see Appendix). Although this explicitly excludes punctured domains, we remark that the proof still apply to at least some of them. In fact, the law of Z^D, and thus the whole limit point process, remains unchanged when a polar set is removed from D. (One can see this from the Gibbs-Markov property and the fact that $C^{D,\widetilde{D}} = 0$ if $\widetilde{D} \subseteq D$ with $D \setminus \widetilde{D}$ polar.) Thus, for instance, $Z^{\mathbb{D}}$ will have the same law as Z^D for $D := \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$. An intuitive way to see this is that the DGFF in the lattice version of $\mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$ is that in $\mathbb{D}$ but pinned at the origin. The pinning has a non-vanishing effect only up to lattice distances $o(N)$ which, however, is also a region where no relevant local maxima would occur to begin with.

(2) *Formulation of the Gibbs-Markov property*: A consequence of the Gibbs-Markov property of the DGFF is that $Z^{D\cup\widetilde{D}}$, for $D, \widetilde{D} \in \mathfrak{D}$ disjoint, factors into the sum $Z^D + Z^{\widetilde{D}}$ of independent copies of the measures in D and $\widetilde{D}$, respectively. This is guaranteed automatically for the measures arising in Theorem 2.1 but has to be assumed explicitly in Theorem 2.8.

(3) *Conditions for uniqueness*: The conditions in Theorem 2.8 are definitely far from sharp. First off, they are not even independent; e.g., the stochastic absolute continuity can be derived from (properly formulated) Gibbs-Markov property. We in fact suspect that same should apply to condition (4); indeed, in the absence of this type of tail, the Gibbs-Markov property should imply that the measures are either trivial or identically infinity. We pose this as:

Conjecture 2.9 *Any family of random Borel measures $\{M^D : D \in \mathfrak{D}\}$ satisfying conditions (0-3) of Theorem 2.8 obeys also condition (4) thereof, for ψ^D as in* (2.14) *with some $C_\star \in [0,\infty)$.*

If this is indeed resolved affirmatively, Theorem 2.8 would show that any such family (including $\{Z^D : D \in \mathfrak{D}\}$) is a constant multiple of the critical Liouville Quantum Gravity measures from [25]. We remark that, as noted earlier, assuming the existence of a limit density in (2.20), the conformal transformation rule (2.10) forces it to be of the form (2.14).

2.6 Outline.

The remainder of the paper is devoted to the proofs of the above results. In Section 3 we begin with some preliminaries concerning the Gibbs-Markov property of the DGFF, its convergence to to CGFF, etc. In particular, we prove Lemma 2.3. We also recall a couple of standard Gaussian inequalities that will be useful in our subsequent derivations.

In Section 4, we proceed to prove Theorem 2.1, dealing with existence and form of the limit of processes $\{\eta^D_{N,r_N}\}$. The crux of the proof is its reduction to the corresponding result for square boxes established in Biskup and Louidor [9]. This is achieved in Proposition 4.2 whose formulation then permits a quick extraction of Theorem 2.4 as well. Corollary 2.2 then readily follows.

Our next task, in Section 5, is the proof of the asymptotic tail behavior in Theorem 2.6. Again, we will reduce this to a corresponding result for square boxes proved in Bramson, Ding and Zeitouni [16]. The key reduction step is a link between the law of the maximizer in a set D_N and that in a slightly smaller square box. This is the content of (rather technical) Proposition 5.2. Worthy of independent attention is our proof of the representation (2.14). This appears towards the end of proof of Theorem 2.6 in Section 5.1.

The proofs then proceed in a somewhat different order than the statements. Indeed, we first prove that any family of measures $\{M^D : D \in \mathfrak{D}\}$ satisfying the conditions of Theorem 2.8 is

a distributional limit of derivative-martingale like measures. Although the corresponding statement, Theorem 6.1, is quite close to Theorem 1.4 of Biskup and Louidor [9], the method of proof is quite different. In particular, we rely on partitions into triangles rather than squares as the "binding" field, $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$, with respect to such partitions can be controlled in terms of the DGFF on the triangular lattice. With the derivative-martingale like representation in hand, we then readily prove Theorem 2.8 as well.

In Section 7, we in turn proceed to use the same representation to show that the laws of measures $\{Z^D\colon D\in\mathfrak{D}\}$ are rotation invariant. Then, in Theorem 7.2 we give conditions for families of measures that guarantee the validity of the conformal transformation rule (2.10). Not surprisingly, these boil down to invariance with respect to shifts, rotations and dilations and the validity of the Gibbs-Markov property. This finally completes the proofs of all results.

The Appendix discusses the behavior of the harmonic measure under discrete and continuous approximations of our class of underlying domains.

3. Preliminary considerations

We begin by reviewing and further developing some tools from the theory of Gaussian processes and, particularly, the DGFF. An informed reader may consider just skimming through the statements below and then moving to the next section.

3.1 The Gibbs-Markov property.

As already indicated, an important technical input for many of our arguments is the Gibbs-Markov decomposition of the DGFF. Recall that h^V denotes the DGFF on V with zero values in V^{c}. Given non-empty finite sets $U\subset V\subset\mathbb{Z}^2$, denote

$$\varphi^{V,U}(x):=E\bigl(h^V(x)\,\big|\,\sigma(h^V(y),\,y\in V\smallsetminus U)\bigr),\qquad x\in U. \tag{3.1}$$

It follows from (1.1) that $\{h^V(x)-\varphi^{V,U}(x)\colon x\in U\}$ is independent of $\{\varphi^{V,U}(x)\colon x\in U\}$ and $h^V-\varphi^{V,U}\overset{\text{law}}{=}h^U$. Equivalently we can write this as

$$h^V\overset{\text{law}}{=}h^U+\varphi^{U,V}, \tag{3.2}$$

where on the right-hand side h^U is regarded as independent of $\varphi^{V,U}$.

The Gibbs-Markov decomposition (3.2) permits us to extend certain tightness results known for square boxes to general domains. Let $D\in\mathfrak{D}$ and write

$$\Gamma_N^D(t):=\bigl\{x\in D_N\colon h_N^D(x)\ge m_N-t\bigr\}, \tag{3.3}$$

where we recall that $m_N+O(1)$ is the scale of the absolute maximum in V_N. Then we have:

Proposition 3.1 *For all $D\in\mathfrak{D}$ and all $t\in\mathbb{R}$, the family $\{|\Gamma_N^D(t)|\colon N\ge1\}$ is tight. Moreover, for any $A\subset D$ non-empty and open,*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\liminf_{N\to\infty}P\bigl(\exists x\in\Gamma_N^D(t)\colon x/N\in A\bigr)=1. \tag{3.4}$$

Proposition 3.2 *For all $D\in\mathfrak{D}$ and all $t\in\mathbb{R}$,*

$$\lim_{r\to\infty}\limsup_{N\to\infty}P\bigl(\exists x,y\in\Gamma_N^D(t)\colon r<|x-y|<N/r\bigr)=0. \tag{3.5}$$

Proposition 3.3 *For each $D \in \mathfrak{D}$ there is a constant $c = c(D)$ such that for all $t \geq 1$, all $N \geq 1$ and all sets $A \subseteq D_N$,*

$$P\bigl(\exists x \in A\colon h_N^D(x) \geq m_N + t\bigr) \leq c\left(\frac{|A|}{N^2}\right)^{1/2} t\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha t}. \tag{3.6}$$

Versions of these results (with explicit estimates on $|\Gamma_N^D(t)|$ in the first proposition) for a square domain $D := (0,1)^2$ have been proved in Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.1 in Ding and Zeitouni [23] (for Propositions 3.1 and 3.2, respectively) and Lemma 3.8 of Bramson, Ding and Zeitouni [16] (for Proposition 3.3). The additional input required to extend these to general domains comes via the following comparison bounds:

Lemma 3.4 *Let $U \subset V \subset W$ be finite subsets of $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Then for all $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $R \geq 0$,*

$$P\bigl(\exists x \in U\colon h^V(x) \geq c + R\bigr) \leq (1 - \tfrac{1}{2}\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{2}R^2/\sigma^2})^{-1} P\bigl(\exists x \in U\colon h^W(x) \geq c\bigr) \tag{3.7}$$

where $\sigma^2 := \max_{x\in U} \mathrm{Var}(\varphi^{W,V}(x))$. Similarly, for all $r_1 < r_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} &P\bigl(\exists x,y \in U\colon h^V(x), h^V(y) \geq c,\, r_1 < |x-y| < r_2\bigr) \\ &\qquad\qquad \leq 4P\bigl(\exists x,y \in U\colon h^W(x), h^W(y) \geq c,\, r_1 < |x-y| < r_2\bigr). \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Finally, for all $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and all integers $R > 0$,

$$P\bigl(|\{x \in U\colon h^V(x) \geq c\}| \geq 2R\bigr) \leq 2P\bigl(|\{x \in U\colon h^W(x) \geq c\}| \geq R\bigr). \tag{3.9}$$

Proof. Recall that we may set $h^W := h^V + \varphi^{W,V}$ with h^V and $\varphi^{W,V}$ independent. Then

$$\bigl\{\exists x \in U\colon h^V(x) \geq c + R,\, \varphi^{W,V}(x) > -R\bigr\} \subseteq \bigl\{\exists x \in U\colon h^W(x) \geq c\bigr\}. \tag{3.10}$$

Fix some complete ordering of vertices in U and decrease the event on the left by requiring that $\varphi^{W,V}(x) > -R$ at the "first" $x \in U$ where $h^V(x) \geq c$. Since h^V and $\varphi^{W,V}$ are independent, we get (3.7) by a standard Gaussian estimate.

The same argument (modulo duplication of variables) with $R := 0$ works for (3.8) except that to get the factor 4 on the right hand side, we have to show that

$$P\bigl(\varphi^{W,V}(x) > 0,\, \varphi^{W,V}(y) > 0\bigr) \geq \frac{1}{4}. \tag{3.11}$$

For this it suffices to note that the covariance of $\varphi^{W,V}(x)$ and $\varphi^{W,V}(y)$ is non-negative and then apply the general fact that if X and X' are two mean-zero Gaussians with $\mathrm{Cov}(X,X') \geq 0$, then $P(X \geq 0, X' \geq 0) \geq \frac{1}{4}$.

Also in the proof of (3.9) we proceed similarly as for (3.7). First we note that

$$\Bigl\{\bigl|\{x \in U\colon h^V(x) \geq c,\, \varphi^{W,V}(x) > 0\}\bigr| \geq R\Bigr\} \subseteq \Bigl\{\bigl|\{x \in U\colon h^W(x) \geq c\}\bigr| \geq R\Bigr\}. \tag{3.12}$$

Now the event on the left is a superset of the event that the number of vertices in U where $h^V(x) \geq c$ is at least $2R$ and that at least R of those vertices have $\varphi^{W,V}(x) > 0$. In light of symmetry and independence of h^V and $\varphi^{W,V}$, conditional on the "first" $2R$ vertices where $h^V(x) \geq c$ (with respect to some fixed complete order on U), the latter event has probability at least a half. The inequality (3.9) then follows. □

Now we can move on to the proofs of the above propositions. In these proofs we will frequently use the notation S_K for the continuum box $(0,K)^2$ and, abusing the notation somewhat, also its discrete counterpart $(0,K)^2\cap\mathbb{Z}^2$.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. First we address the tightness of $|\Gamma_N^D(t)|$. Since D is bounded, there exist $a\in\mathbb{R}$ and $K\in\mathbb{N}$ such that $D\subset(a,a+K)^2$. By shift invariance of the DGFF, we may assume that $a:=0$. Then (3.9) reduces the tightness of $|\Gamma_N^D(t)|$ to the tightness of $|\Gamma_N^{S_K}(t)|$. The definitions also give

$$\bigl|\Gamma_N^{S_K}(t)\bigr| \overset{\text{law}}{=} \bigl|\Gamma_{NK}^{S_1}(t+m_N-m_{NK})\bigr|. \tag{3.13}$$

Since $t\mapsto\Gamma_N^{S_1}(t)$ is non-increasing and $m_{KN}-m_N=g\log K+o(1)=O(1)$ as $N\to\infty$, the tightness of $|\Gamma_N^{S_K}(t)|$ follows from Theorem 1.2 of Ding and Zeitouni [23].

Moving on to the proof of (3.4), we use that A is open to find an open square S such that $\overline{S}\subset A$. The main result of Bramson and Zeitouni [17] implies $P(\max h_N^S\ge m_N-t)\to1$ as $N\to\infty$ and $t\to\infty$. (Strictly speaking, the result if formulated for a unit square but slight adjustments to the size of S and the fact that $m_{NK}-m_K=O(1)$ as $N\to\infty$ make it hold for all open squares.) The claim will then follow from (3.7) by taking $c:=t$ and letting $R\to\infty$ afterwards, provided we can check that

$$\sup_{N\ge1}\max_{x\in S_N}\operatorname{Var}\bigl(\varphi^{D_N,A_N}(x)\bigr)<\infty. \tag{3.14}$$

To this end, we first recall the representation using the discrete Green functions

$$\operatorname{Var}\bigl(\varphi^{D_N,A_N}(x)\bigr)=G_{D_N}(x,x)-G_{A_N}(x,x). \tag{3.15}$$

Now let S' and S'' be open squares such that $S''\subset S\subset D\subset S'$ and that x is in the center of their discrete counterparts S'_N and S''_N. The natural monotonicity of the Green function in the underlying set yields

$$G_{D_N}(x,x)-G_{A_N}(x,x)\le G_{S'_N}(x,x)-G_{S''_N}(x,x). \tag{3.16}$$

In light of the logarithmic asymptotic for the Green function, the right-hand side is bounded by a quantity that depends only on the ratio of side-lengths of S' and S''. As $\overline{S}\subset A$, this ratio is bounded uniformly in $x\in S_N$. □

Proof of Proposition 3.2. The argument here is fairly analogous to those used in the previous proof: For a square S of integer side-length, the claim boils down to Theorem 1.1 of Ding and Zeitouni [23]. Thanks to (3.8), it then extends to any $D\subset S$ as well. □

Proof of Proposition 3.3. We first recall that, by Lemma 3.8 of Bramson, Ding and Zeitouni [16], for unit-square domain S_1 and any $A\subset(0,N)^2\cap\mathbb{Z}^2$, we have

$$P\bigl(\exists x\in A\colon h_N^{S_1}(x)\ge m_N+t-s\bigr)\le c\Bigl(\frac{|A|}{N^2}\Bigr)^{1/2}t\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha(t-s)},\qquad s\ge0,\,t\ge1. \tag{3.17}$$

In light of $h_N^{S_K}(x)=h^{S_{KN}}(x)=h_{NK}^{S_1}(x)$ and the fact that $m_{NK}-m_K=O(1)$ as $N\to\infty$, this yields the same claim for domain $S_K:=(0,K)^2$ and any $A\subset NS_K$, provided c is adjusted by a K-dependent factor. The bound (3.7) with $R:=0$ then extends this to all $D\subset S_K$ as well. □

3.2 Continuum limit.

Our next task is the extraction of the continuum limit for the "binding field" $\varphi^{U,V}$ provided both domains properly scale with N. First off, let us check that the purported limit object, the continuum Gaussian field $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$, is well defined:

Proof of Lemma 2.3. As is readily checked, the continuum Green function, i.e., the integral kernel of the operator $(-\frac{1}{4}\Delta)^{-1}$ in D, admits the representation

$$G^D(x,y) = g\int_{\partial D}\Pi^D(x,\mathrm{d}z)\log|z-y| - g\log|y-x| \tag{3.18}$$

for all $x,y\in D$ with $x\neq y$. Assuming $\widetilde{D}\subseteq D$, this immediately gives

$$C^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x,y) = G^D(x,y) - G^{\widetilde{D}}(x,y), \qquad x,y\in\widetilde{D}, x\neq y. \tag{3.19}$$

By the properties of the Poisson kernel, $x\mapsto\int_{\partial D}\Pi^D(x,\mathrm{d}z)\log|z-y|$ is harmonic on D for all $y\in D$. Hence, so is $x\mapsto C^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x,y)$ on $\widetilde{D}$ for all $y\in\widetilde{D}$. The Green function is symmetric, since the Laplacian is a symmetric operator, and thus $C^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ is symmetric as well.

The difference in (3.19) is defined by (3.18) only for $x\neq y$ but it extends continuously to $x=y$ by the aforementioned harmonicity in x. In particular, $C^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ is symmetric and harmonic on $\widetilde{D}$ in both variables. To see that $C^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ is positive semidefinite, we again invoke (3.19) and the fact that the Laplacian on D dominates the Laplacian on $\widetilde{D}$ in the sense of comparison of quadratic forms.

It follows that $C^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ is a covariance kernel on $\widetilde{D}\times\widetilde{D}$ and so there is a mean-zero Gaussian process $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ on $\widetilde{D}$ with covariance function $C^{D,\widetilde{D}}$. As the covariance is smooth, so are the sample paths of $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ a.s., by Kolmogorov-Čenstov criteria. The path-wise harmonicity of $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ is checked by noting that both the mean and the variance of $\Delta\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ vanish. □

Next let us address the passage to continuum limit. Given $\widetilde{D},D\in\mathfrak{D}$ with $\widetilde{D}\subseteq D$, we will write $\varphi_N^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ as a shorthand for $\varphi^{D_N,\widetilde{D}_N}$. Then we have:

Proposition 3.5 *Let $\widetilde{D},D\in\mathfrak{D}$ obey $\widetilde{D}\subseteq D$. Then for all $x,y\in\widetilde{D}$*

$$\mathrm{Cov}\big(\varphi_N^{D,\widetilde{D}}(\lfloor xN\rfloor),\varphi_N^{D,\widetilde{D}}(\lfloor yN\rfloor)\big)\underset{N\to\infty}{\longrightarrow}C^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x,y), \tag{3.20}$$

with the convergence uniform over closed subsets of $\widetilde{D}\times\widetilde{D}$. In particular, $\varphi_N^{D,\widetilde{D}}(\lfloor\cdot N\rfloor)$ tends to $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(\cdot)$ in the sense of finite dimensional distributions.

For the proof we will need to work with the discrete harmonic measure $H_N^D(x,y)$ on D_N which is the probability that the simple symmetric random walk started from $x\in D_N$ exits D_N at the point $y\in\partial D_N$. By Lemma A.1 in the Appendix, $H^D(\lfloor Nx\rfloor,\lfloor N\cdot\rfloor)\to\Pi^D(x,\cdot)$ in the vague (or even weak) topology on the space of probability measures. We also introduce the shorthand

$$D^\delta := \big\{x\in D\colon \mathrm{d}(x,D^{\mathrm{c}})>\delta\big\}, \tag{3.21}$$

where $\delta>0$ is small enough so that D^δ is non-empty. Notice that if $D\in\mathfrak{D}$, then also $D^\delta\in\mathfrak{D}$ provided δ is small enough.

Proof of Proposition 3.5. We use the well-known fact that the discrete Green function G_{D_N} also admits a representation of the form (3.18),

$$G_{D_N}(x,y) = \sum_{z\in\partial D_N} H_N^D(x,z)a(y-z) - a(x-y) \tag{3.22}$$

where $a\colon \mathbb{Z}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is the potential kernel for the simple symmetric random walk on $\mathbb{Z}^2$. The asymptotic of a is well known,

$$a(x) = g\log|x| + c_0 + O\bigl(|x|^{-2}\bigr), \qquad |x|\to\infty, \tag{3.23}$$

for some constant c_0; see, e.g., Lawler [30] or Kozma and Schreiber [28]. Assuming that $x,y \in (\widetilde{D}^\delta)_N$ for some small $\delta > 0$, we thus get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Cov}\bigl(\varphi_N^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x), \varphi_N^{D,\widetilde{D}}(y)\bigr) = g\sum_{z\in\partial D_N} H_N^D(x,z)\log|y-z| \\ - g\sum_{z\in\partial \widetilde{D}_N} H_N^{\widetilde{D}}(x,z)\log|y-z| + o(1),\end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

where we used that $H_N^D(x,z)$ is a probability measure to cancel the constant term in (3.23) and bound the error uniformly in $x,y\in\widetilde{D}^\delta$.

The functions $z\mapsto\log|y-z|$ are bounded and continuous on a neighborhood of ∂D, resp., $\partial\widetilde{D}$, and so the convergence in (3.20) follows from (A.1). Equicontinuity in $y\in\widetilde{D}^\delta$ then shows that the limit is uniform in $y\in\widetilde{D}^\delta$, for every $x\in\widetilde{D}^\delta$. The uniformity clause in Lemma A.1 then applies the same with x and y interchanged, from which the claimed joint uniformity follows by a 2ε-argument. As all processes are centered Gaussian, the convergence of the covariances implies convergence in the sense of finite-dimensional distributions. □

3.3 Some Gaussian inequalities.

Next we will apply some standard Gaussian inequalities to derive much needed tightness of the maximum and Gaussian tails for the fluctuations of both $\varphi_N^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ and $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$. This will be done by invoking the Fernique inequality and the Borell-Tsirelson inequality. First we remind the reader of the statements of these general bounds.

Consider a centered Gaussian field X_t indexed by points t in the (pseudo)metric space $(\mathfrak{X},\rho)$, where $\rho(t,t') := [E((X_t - X_{t'})^2)]^{1/2}$. Given any Borel probability measure m on $\mathfrak{X}$ and writing $B_\rho(t,r) := \{t'\in\mathfrak{X}\colon \rho(t,t')\le r\}$, the Fernique inequality states that

$$E\bigl(\sup_{t\in\mathfrak{X}} X_t\bigr) \le K\sup_{t\in\mathfrak{X}}\int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log\frac{1}{m(B_\rho(t,r))}}\,\mathrm{d}r \tag{3.25}$$

for some universal constant $K<\infty$. See, e.g., Adler [1, Theorem 4.1]. The Borell-Tsirelson inequality then controls the fluctuation of $\sup_{t\in\mathfrak{X}} X_t$ from its mean by stating that these have tails of a centered Gaussian with variance $\sigma^2 := \sup_{t\in\mathfrak{X}} E(X_t^2)$. Based on these, we now claim:

Proposition 3.6 *Let $D,\widetilde{D}\in\mathfrak{D}$ obey $\widetilde{D}\subseteq D$. Then for all $\delta>0$ small,*

$$\sup_{N\ge1} E\Bigl(\max_{x\in\widetilde{D}_N^\delta}\varphi_N^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)\Bigr) < \infty. \tag{3.26}$$

Moreover, there are $c, c' \in (0,\infty)$ — which depend on D, $\widetilde{D}$ and δ — such that for all $N \geq 1$ and all $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\biggl(\Bigl|\max_{x\in\widetilde{D}_N^\delta} \varphi_N^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x) - E\max_{x\in\widetilde{D}_N^\delta} \varphi_N^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)\Bigr| > t\biggr) \leq c\mathrm{e}^{-c't^2}. \tag{3.27}$$

Completely analogous bounds — with $x \in \widetilde{D}_N^\delta$ replaced by $x \in \widetilde{D}^\delta$ — hold for $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$.

Proof. As $\widetilde{D}^\delta$ can be covered by a finite number of open squares whose closure is still contained in $\widetilde{D}$, it suffices to prove this for one such a square S. Consider the random fields $\varphi_N^{D,\widetilde{D}}(\lfloor\cdot N\rfloor)$ and $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(\cdot)$ on S. As observed before, the covariances of these are bounded throughout S uniformly in N while the harmonicity ensures that they are Lipschitz functions in both arguments, uniformly in N over S. Letting L denote the requisite Lipschitz constant we have $\rho(x,y) \leq L\sqrt{|x-y|}$. In particular, the ball $B_\rho(x,r)$ in ρ-metric thus contains the part of the Euclidean ball of radius $(r/L)^2$ that is contained in S.

Using the normalized Lebesgue measure on S for m in (3.25), the regularity of the boundary of S implies that $m(B_\rho(t,r)) \geq c(r/L)^4$ for $r > 0$ small where $c > 0$ is a constant. It follows that the integral in (3.25) is finite, uniformly in N, thus proving (3.26). For (3.27) we just apply the Borell-Tsirellson inequality with the fact that the variances of the two fields are uniformly bounded on $\widetilde{D}^\delta$. □

Similar arguments also permit us to prove the following claim that will be useful in our approximation arguments in Section 4.

Proposition 3.7 *Let $D \in \mathfrak{D}$ and recall the set D^δ from* (3.21)*. Then for each $x \in D$,*

$$\sup_{\substack{D':\, x\in D'\\ D^\delta\subseteq D'\subseteq D}} \mathrm{Var}\bigl(\Phi^{D,D'}(x)\bigr) \underset{\delta\downarrow 0}{\longrightarrow} 0 \tag{3.28}$$

locally uniformly in D and, for any open set A with $\overline{A} \subset D$, also

$$\sup_{\substack{D':\, A\subseteq D'\\ D^\delta\subseteq D'\subseteq D}} P\Bigl(\sup_{x\in A}\bigl|\Phi^{D,D'}(x)\bigr| > \varepsilon\Bigr) \underset{\delta\downarrow 0}{\longrightarrow} 0 \tag{3.29}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. Let D' be such that $D^\delta \subseteq D' \subseteq D$. Then

$$\Phi^{D,D^\delta} \overset{\text{law}}{=} \Phi^{D,D'} + \Phi^{D',D^\delta} \tag{3.30}$$

with the two fields on the right independent. This shows that $\mathrm{Var}(\Phi^{D,D'}(x)) \leq \mathrm{Var}(\Phi^{D,D^\delta}(x))$ for all $x \in D^\delta$. By Lemma A.2 we have $C^{D,D^\delta}(\cdot,\cdot) \to 0$ locally uniformly in D and, using Cauchy-Schwarz, the same thus applies to the supremum of $|C^{D,D'}(\cdot,\cdot)|$ over all D' as above.

This observation immediately yields (3.28). For (3.29) we again notice that, by a covering argument it suffices to prove this for A equal to a square S with $\overline{S} \subset D$. Thanks to harmonicity, also $|C^{D,D'}(x,y) - C^{D,D'}(x,y')|/|y-y'| \to 0$ as $\delta \downarrow 0$ uniformly in $x, y, y' \in S$ with $y \neq y'$ and in D' squeezed between $D^\delta \cup S$ and D. This implies that the (pseudo)metric ρ induced on S by the Gaussian field $\Phi^{D,D'}$ obeys $\rho(x,y) \leq L_n\sqrt{|x-y|}$, where $L_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Using again the

normalized Lebesgue measure on S for m in (3.25), we find out (as in the previous proof) that $m(B_\rho(x,r)) \geq c(r/L_n)^4$ for some $c>0$. As the ρ-diameter of S is at most order L_n, we get

$$\sup_{\substack{D':\,A\subseteq D'\\ D^\delta\subseteq D'\subseteq D}} E\Bigl(\sup_{x\in A}\bigl|\Phi^{D,D'}(x)\bigr|\Bigr)\underset{\delta\downarrow 0}{\longrightarrow} 0 \tag{3.31}$$

However, by the Borell-Tsirelson inequality, $\sup_{x\in A}\Phi^{D,D'}(x)$ has uniformly small Gaussian tails whose "variance" tends to zero uniformly in D' as above. This yields (3.25) without the absolute value. The symmetry $\Phi^{D,D'}\overset{\text{law}}{=}-\Phi^{D,D'}$ then implies the full statement by a union bound. □

To make the list of our preliminaries complete, we also recall the Kahane convexity inequality in the form that will be suitable to our needs:

Proposition 3.8 *Let $\Phi(x)$ and $\widetilde\Phi(x)$ be continuous Gaussian fields indexed by points in an open set $D\subset\mathbb{R}^2$. Assume*

$$\mathrm{Cov}\bigl(\Phi(x),\Phi(y)\bigr)\geq \mathrm{Cov}\bigl(\widetilde\Phi(x),\widetilde\Phi(y)\bigr),\qquad x,y\in D. \tag{3.32}$$

Then for any finite Borel measure σ on D,

$$E\biggl(\exp\Bigl\{-\int\sigma(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{e}^{\Phi(x)-\frac12\mathrm{Var}(\Phi(x))}\Bigr\}\biggr)\geq E\biggl(\exp\Bigl\{-\int\sigma(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{e}^{\widetilde\Phi(x)-\frac12\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde\Phi(x))}\Bigr\}\biggr). \tag{3.33}$$

Proof. This goes back to Kahane [27]. The proof boils down to a computation of the t-derivative of the expectation with Φ replaced by $\sqrt{t}\,\Phi+\sqrt{1-t}\,\widetilde\Phi$, where Φ and $\widetilde\Phi$ are regarded as independent. The same argument applies even when the exponential (of the integral) is replaced by any convex function (of the integral) with at most exponential growth at infinity. □

4. Convergence and Gibbs-Markov property

Here we will prove Theorems 2.1 and Theorem 2.4. For Theorem 2.1 the key idea is to approximate general domains from within by families of disjoint squares for which the result can be drawn from Biskup and Louidor [9]. Notwithstanding, various limit statements need to be invoked and this is where the propositions from the previous section will come useful. A bonus point is that the arguments then directly yield Theorem 2.4 as well.

4.1 Reduction to subsets.

We first address the reduction to a subset of the underlying domain. Pick $D\in\mathfrak{D}$. We will generally consider approximations $D^n\in\mathfrak{D}$ of D such that

$$D^n\subset D,\ \forall n\geq 1,\quad\text{and}\quad\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathrm{Leb}(D\smallsetminus D^n)=0. \tag{4.1}$$

Next we introduce a (continuous) mollifier that will help us deal with various boundary issues. For $\varepsilon>0$, let $\chi_{n,\varepsilon}:D\to[0,1]$ be given by

$$\chi_{n,\varepsilon}(x)=1\wedge\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\bigl(\mathrm{d}(x,(D^n)^{\mathrm{c}})-\varepsilon\bigr)_+ \tag{4.2}$$

Obviously, $\chi_{n,\varepsilon}$ is a continuous with $\chi_{n,\varepsilon}(x)=0$ when $\mathrm{d}(x,(D^n)^{\mathrm{c}})\leq\varepsilon$ and $\chi_{n,\varepsilon}(x)=1$ when $\mathrm{d}(x,(D^n)^{\mathrm{c}})\geq 2\varepsilon$. In addition, $\varepsilon\mapsto\chi_{n,\varepsilon}(x)$ is non-increasing for all x.

The first step of the proof is a passage from the process in D to that in D^n. This will naturally lead us to consider the continuum Gaussian field Φ^{D,D^n} which, we recall, has zero mean and covariance C^{D,D^n} as defined in (3.19). Given a realization of Φ^{D,D^n} and a continuous, compactly supported function $f\colon \overline{D}\times\mathbb{R}\to[0,\infty)$, define

$$f^{D,D^n}_{\varepsilon,\Phi}(x,h) := f\bigl(x, h+\Phi^{D,D^n}(x)\bigr)\chi_{n,\varepsilon}(x), \qquad (x,h)\in D^n\times\mathbb{R}. \tag{4.3}$$

Note that, for each fixed n, ε and Φ^{D,D^n}, this is still a bounded, continuous, non-negative function with compact support. The main reduction step is now the content of:

Proposition 4.1 *Suppose that D and D^n satisfy* (4.1) *and let r_N be such that $r_N\to\infty$ with $r_N/N\to 0$. Then for any continuous function $f\colon \overline{D}\times\mathbb{R}\to[0,\infty)$ with compact support,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\limsup_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\limsup_{r\to\infty}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\Bigl|E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle\eta^D_{N,r_N},f\rangle}-E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle\eta^{D^n}_{N,r},f^{D,D^n}_{\varepsilon,\Phi}\rangle}\Bigr|=0. \tag{4.4}$$

Here the second expectation is over $\eta^{D^n}_{N,r}$ and Φ^{D,D^n}, regarded as independent.

We defer the proof temporarily, as it will require a lot of technical steps, and instead demonstrate how this can be used to establish Theorems 2.1 and 2.4. For that we need to prove:

Proposition 4.2 *Suppose that D and D^n satisfy* (4.1) *and that, for each $n\ge 1$, there is an a.s. finite random Borel measure Z^{D^n} on D^n such that, for any $r'_N\to\infty$ with $r'_N/N\to 0$,*

$$\eta^{D^n}_{N,r'_N}\xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{\text{law}}\mathrm{PPP}\bigl(Z^{D^n}(\mathrm{d}x)\otimes\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha h}\mathrm{d}h\bigr), \tag{4.5}$$

where $\alpha:=2/\sqrt{g}$. Then there is an a.s. finite random measure $Z^D(\mathrm{d}x)$ on $\overline{D}$ such that, for any $r_N\to\infty$ with $r_N/N\to 0$,

$$\eta^{D}_{N,r_N}\xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{\text{law}}\mathrm{PPP}\bigl(Z^{D}(\mathrm{d}x)\otimes\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha h}\mathrm{d}h\bigr). \tag{4.6}$$

Moreover, we have

$$Z^{D^n}(\mathrm{d}x)\,\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,D^n}(x)}\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\text{law}}Z^D(\mathrm{d}x), \tag{4.7}$$

where on the left Φ^{D,D^n} is a mean-zero Gaussian field on D^n with covariance C^{D,D^n}, regarded as independent of Z^{D^n}.

Proof. Let r_N be any sequence with $r_N\to\infty$ with $r_N/N\to 0$. By Proposition 4.1, we may find a sequence r'_N satisfying $r'_N\to\infty$ with $r'_N/N\to 0$ such that, for any bounded and continuous function $f\colon\overline{D}\times\mathbb{R}\to[0,\infty)$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\limsup_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\Bigl|E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle\eta^D_{N,r_N},f\rangle}-E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle\eta^{D^n}_{N,r'_N},f^{D,D^n}_{\varepsilon,\Phi}\rangle}\Bigr|=0. \tag{4.8}$$

Now $f^{D,D^n}_{\varepsilon,\Phi}$ is continuous with compact support for a.e. realization of Φ^{D,D^n}, so conditioning on Φ^{D,D^n} and applying (4.5) along with the Bounded Convergence Theorem yields

$$E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle\eta^{D^n}_{N,r'_N},f^{D,D^n}_{\varepsilon,\Phi}\rangle}\xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{}E\biggl(\exp\Bigl\{-\int(1-\mathrm{e}^{-f^{D,D^n}_{\varepsilon,\Phi}})\,Z^{D^n}(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha h}\mathrm{d}h\Bigr\}\biggr), \tag{4.9}$$

where Z^{D^n} is independent of Φ^{D,D^n}. Since $\langle \eta^D_{N,r_N}, f\rangle$ is independent of n or ε, this and (4.8) ensure that the limits

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle \eta^D_{N,r_N}, f\rangle} \quad\text{and}\quad \lim_{n\to\infty}\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\lim_{N\to\infty} E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle \eta^{D^n}_{N,r'_N}, f^{D,D^n}_{\varepsilon,\Phi}\rangle} \tag{4.10}$$

exist and are equal. It thus suffices to pass to the limit $\varepsilon\downarrow 0$ followed by $n\to\infty$ on the right-hand side of (4.9).

Plugging in the explicit form of $f^{D,D^n}_{\varepsilon,\Phi}$ and substituting h for $h+\Phi^{D,D^n}(x)$ yields

$$\text{r.h.s. of (4.9)} = E\biggl(\exp\Bigl\{-\int (1-\mathrm{e}^{-f(x,h)\chi_{n,\varepsilon}(x)})\,\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,D^n}(x)}\,Z^{D^n}(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha h}\mathrm{d}h\Bigr\}\biggr). \tag{4.11}$$

Since $\chi_{n,\varepsilon}$ increases pointwise to the indicator of D^n as $\varepsilon\downarrow 0$, the fact that Z^{D^n} puts all mass on D^n allows us to take $\varepsilon\downarrow 0$ and get, with the help of the Monotone Convergence Theorem in the exponent and the Bounded Convergence Theorem overall, that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle \eta^D_{N,r_N}, f\rangle} = \lim_{n\to\infty} E\biggl(\exp\Bigl\{-\int (1-\mathrm{e}^{-f(x,h)})\,\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,D^n}(x)}Z^{D^n}(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha h}\mathrm{d}h\Bigr\}\biggr). \tag{4.12}$$

But the processes $\{\eta^D_{N,r_N}\}$ are tight as measures on $\overline{D}\times\mathbb{R}$ thanks to Proposition 3.1. So taking appropriate f's with small supremum norm shows that the random variables

$$\Bigl\{\int Z^{D^n}(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,D^n}(x)} : n\ge 1\Bigr\} \tag{4.13}$$

are tight. We can thus find a sequence $n_k\to\infty$ such that $Z^{D_{n_k}}(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,D^{n_k}}(x)}$ converge weakly to a random measure $Z^D(\mathrm{d}x)$ concentrated on $\overline{D}$. This permits passing the limit $n\to\infty$ inside in (4.12) and thus proving the claim. □

We can now prove convergence to the Cox process in Theorem 2.1:

Proof of Theorem 2.1, convergence to Cox process. We begin by recalling the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 of [9]. This theorem was stated for D being a unit square but simple scaling arguments allow us to extend it to squares of rational sizes. Let $K\in(0,\infty)\cap\mathbb{Q}$ and define $S_K := (0,K)^2$. Then for any sequence r_N as given,

$$\eta^{S_K}_{N,r_N} \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{\text{law}} \mathrm{PPP}\bigl(Z^{S_K}(\mathrm{d}x)\otimes\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha h}\mathrm{d}h\bigr), \tag{4.14}$$

where Z^{S_K} is a random measure obtained from that for the unit square by

$$Z^{S_K}(\mathrm{d}x) \overset{\text{law}}{=} K^4 Z^{S_1}(K^{-1}\mathrm{d}x). \tag{4.15}$$

Here the exponent 4 arises from the observation that $m_{KN}-m_N = 2\sqrt{g}\log K + o(1)$ as $N\to\infty$ combined with $2\sqrt{g}\,\alpha = 4$.

Now consider any $D\in\mathfrak{D}$. For any integer $n\ge 1$, tile $\mathbb{R}^2$ by disjoint translates of $(0,2^{-n})^2$ by vectors from $(2^{-n}\mathbb{Z})^2$ and let $x_1,\dots,x_{\ell(n)}\in(2^{-n}\mathbb{Z})^2$ enumerate the lower-left corners of those squares that are entirely contained in D. Define

$$D^n := \bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell(n)} \bigl(x_i + S^n\bigr), \qquad \text{where}\quad S^n := (2^{-2n}, 2^{-n}-2^{-2n})^2. \tag{4.16}$$

Since D is open and bounded, $D^n\in\mathfrak{D}$ and the assumptions (4.1) hold.

Since D^n is a union of disjoint squares separated by distance at least 2^{-2n}, as soon as $N > r2^{2n}$ holds, $\eta^{D^n}_{N,r}$ is the sum of $\ell(n)$ independent shifts of the process in S^n. By (4.14) we have (4.5) for any sequence r'_N such that $r'_N \to \infty$ but $r'_N/N \to 0$ with Z^{D^n} given by as the sum of independent copies of Z^{S^n} translated by $x_1,\dots,x_{\ell(n)}$. The convergence of η^D_{N,r_N} to a Cox process with intensity $Z^D(\mathrm{d}x)\otimes \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha h}\mathrm{d}h$ then follows from Proposition 4.2. □

The above argument also shows (2.6):

Proof of Theorem 2.1, disjoint partitions. Suppose that D is the disjoint union $D_1\cup\cdots\cup D_m$. The approximation by squares then naturally splits into m independent processes in $D^n_1,\dots,D^n_m$. This gives $Z^{D^n} = Z^{D^n_1}+\cdots+Z^{D^n_m}$ where the measures on the right are regarded as independent. Similarly, Φ^{D,D^n} restricted to D^n_i has the law of Φ^{D,D^n_i}, with the fields in the disjoint components independent. Hence we get

$$Z^{D^n}(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,D^n}(x)} \overset{\text{law}}{=} Z^{D^n_1}(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,D^n_1}(x)}+\cdots+Z^{D^n_m}(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,D^n_m}(x)}, \tag{4.17}$$

with the measures on the right independent and concentrated on disjoint sets. Applying (4.7) on both sides, the decomposition (2.6) follows. □

Next we check that the Z^D measure is stochastically absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure and, in particular, is thus concentrated on D.

Proof of Theorem 2.1, stochastic absolute continuity. Fix a Borel set $A\subset\overline{D}$ with $\mathrm{Leb}(A)=0$, let $A_n := \{x\in\overline{D}\colon\ \mathrm{dist}(x,A)<2^{-n}\}$ and consider a sequence $f_n\colon \overline{D}\to[0,1]$ of continuous functions supported in $A_n\times[1,4]$ such that $f_n=1$ on $A\times[2,3]$ and such that $f_n\downarrow 0$ on the complement thereof. By the convergence we just proved and the Monotone Convergence Theorem, $\langle\eta^D_{N,r_N},f_n\rangle$ tends in law to a Poisson random variable with (random) parameter $\alpha^{-1}\mathrm{e}^{-2\alpha}(1-\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha})Z^D(A)$ in the limit $N\to\infty$ followed by $n\to\infty$. But Proposition 3.3 tells us

$$P\bigl(\langle\eta^D_{N,r_N},f_n\rangle>0\bigr)\le P\bigl(\exists x\in NA_n\cap\mathbb{Z}^2\colon\ h^D_N(x)\ge m_N+1\bigr)\le c\Bigl(\frac{|NA_n\cap\mathbb{Z}^2|}{N^2}\Bigr)^{1/2}\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha} \tag{4.18}$$

and, since A_n is open, $|NA_n\cap\mathbb{Z}^2|/N^2\to\mathrm{Leb}(A_n)$ as $N\to\infty$. As $\mathrm{Leb}(A_n)\downarrow\mathrm{Leb}(A)=0$, this vanishes in the limits $N\to\infty$ and $n\to\infty$, and so $\langle\eta^D_{N,r_N},f_n\rangle$ in fact tends to zero in probability. It follows that $Z^D(A)=0$ a.s. and, in particular, $Z^D(\partial D)=0$ a.s. □

Proposition 4.2 now helps us to get:

Proof of Corollary 2.2. Shifts $a\in\mathbb{C}$ and dilations $\lambda>0$ taking integer values can directly be implemented on the lattice and so there (2.7) follows immediately from the same calculation as that which led to (4.15). By the existence of the $N\to\infty$ limit, this readily extends to all rational-valued shifts and dilations.

To cover all shifts $a\in\mathbb{C}$ and dilations $\lambda>0$, define $D^n := \{x\in D\colon\ \mathrm{dist}(x,D^{\mathrm{c}})>2^{-n}\}$ and note that $D^n\uparrow D$. Since small shifts and dilations of D^n still lie in D^{n+1}, one can find rational $a_n\in\mathbb{C}$ and $\lambda_n>0$ so that $a_n\to a$, $\lambda_n\to\lambda$ and $a_n+\lambda_n D_n\uparrow a+\lambda D$. Fix an open set A with $\overline{A}\subset D$. Proposition 3.7 shows that $\max_{x\in A}|\Phi^{D,D^n}(x)|\to 0$ in probability and thus

$$1_A(x)Z^{D^n}(\mathrm{d}x)\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\text{law}}1_A(x)Z^D(\mathrm{d}x) \tag{4.19}$$

by Proposition 4.2. Similarly we get

$$1_A(a_n+\lambda_n x)Z^{a_n+\lambda_n D^n}(a_n+\lambda_n\mathrm{d}x)\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\text{law}}1_A(a+\lambda x)Z^{a+\lambda D}(a+\lambda\,\mathrm{d}x). \tag{4.20}$$

Since the laws of the measures on the left are related by a rational shift and dilation, we already know that they are λ_n^4 multiples of each other (in law). From $\lambda_n \to \lambda$ we then infer

$$1_A(a+\lambda x)Z^{a+\lambda D}(a+\lambda\,\mathrm{d}x) \overset{\text{law}}{=} \lambda^4 1_A(x)Z^D(\mathrm{d}x). \tag{4.21}$$

Taking $A \uparrow D$ and using that Z^D is concentrated on D a.s. then yields the claim. □

Invoking Proposition 4.2, we also conclude the Gibbs-Markov property:

Proof of Theorem 2.5. Let $D, \widetilde{D} \in \mathfrak{D}$ with $\mathrm{Leb}(D \smallsetminus \widetilde{D}) = 0$. Set $D^n := \widetilde{D}$ for all $n \geq 1$ and note that (4.1) trivially applies. (Note that we had to first prove concentration of $Z^{\widetilde{D}}$ on $\widetilde{D}$ to make the measure on the left of (4.7) well defined.) By Theorem 2.1, we know that (4.5) holds for any sequence r'_N with the stated properties. Using Proposition 4.2, (4.7) then trivializes as (2.9). □

Finally, we check all of the remaining properties of the Z^D-measures stated in Theorem 2.1:

Proof of Theorem 2.1, remaining properties of Z^D-measure. Almost-sure non-atomicity of Z^D and the fact that, a.s., $Z^D(A) > 0$ for any non-empty open $A \subseteq D$ are known for $D := (0,1)^2$ from Theorem 1.3 of Biskup and Louidor [9]. Invoking the Gibbs-Markov property, this extends to any superset $D \in \mathfrak{D}$ thereof. The scale and dilation invariance from Corollary 2.2 then extends this to all $D \in \mathfrak{D}$. □

4.2 Proof of Proposition 4.1.

For the proofs of Theorems 2.1 and 2.5 to be really complete, we need to provide a proof of Proposition 4.1. This will be done via a sequence of lemmas. Throughout, we will think of h_N^D as defined by $h_N^D := h_N^{D^n} + \varphi_N^{D,D^n}$, where $h_N^{D^n}$ and φ_N^{D,D^n} are independent. Let $\Theta_{N,r}^D$ denote the r-local maxima of h_N^D in D_N and let $\Theta_{N,r}^{D^n}$ denote the r-local maxima of $h_N^{D^n}$ in D_N^n. Note that

$$\langle \eta_{N,r}^D, f\rangle = \sum_{x\in\Theta_{N,r}^D} f\bigl(x/N, h_N^D(x) - m_N\bigr). \tag{4.22}$$

The argument begins by replacing r_N by an independent variable r:

Lemma 4.3 *Let r_N be such that $r_N \to \infty$ with $r_N/N \to 0$. Then for any continuous function $f\colon \overline{D}\times\mathbb{R} \to [0,\infty)$ with compact support,*

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} \limsup_{N\to\infty} P\bigl(\langle \eta_{N,r_N}^D, f\rangle \neq \langle \eta_{N,r}^D, f\rangle\bigr) = 0. \tag{4.23}$$

Proof. We follow the proof of Lemma 4.4 in Biskup and Louidor [9]: Assume $r_N \geq r$ and note that $\langle \eta_{N,r_N}^D, f\rangle \neq \langle \eta_{N,r}^D, f\rangle$ implies the existence of a point in $\Theta_{N,r}^D \smallsetminus \Theta_{N,r_N}^D$ where $f(x/N, h_N^D - m_N) > 0$. If f is supported on $\overline{D}\times[-t,\infty)$, we thus have a point in $\Gamma_N^D(t) \cap (\Theta_{N,r}^D \smallsetminus \Theta_{N,r_N}^D)$. But that implies existence of two points $x, y \in \Gamma_N^D(t)$ such that $r \leq |x-y| \leq r_N$ which, since $r_N \leq N/r$ for N large, has probability tending to zero in the stated limits by Proposition 3.2. □

Next we will insert the mollifier $\chi_{n,\varepsilon}$ next to f inside expectation:

Lemma 4.4 *For any continuous function $f\colon \overline{D}\times\mathbb{R} \to [0,\infty)$ with compact support,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \limsup_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} \limsup_{r\to\infty} \limsup_{N\to\infty} \Bigl| E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle \eta_{N,r}^D, f\rangle} - E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle \eta_{N,r}^D, f\chi_{n,\varepsilon}\rangle}\Bigr| = 0. \tag{4.24}$$

Proof. Suppose f is supported in $\overline{D}\times[-t,\infty)$. Then

$$\mathrm{e}^{-\langle\eta^D_{N,r},f\rangle}-\mathrm{e}^{-\langle\eta^D_{N,r},f\chi_{n,\varepsilon}\rangle}=\mathrm{e}^{-\langle\eta^D_{N,r},f\chi_{n,\varepsilon}\rangle}\bigl(1-\mathrm{e}^{-\langle\eta^D_{N,r},f(1-\chi_{n,\varepsilon})\rangle}\bigr). \tag{4.25}$$

By the restriction on the support of f, we have $\langle\eta^D_{N,r},f(1-\chi_{n,\varepsilon})\rangle\neq 0$ if and only if there is a point in $\Gamma^D_N(t)\setminus D^n_{N,2\varepsilon}$, where (abusing out earlier notations) we write

$$D^n_{N,\delta}:=ND^n_\delta\cap\mathbb{Z}^2\quad\text{for}\quad D^n_\delta:=\bigl\{x\in D^n\colon \mathrm{d}(x,(D^n)^{\mathrm{c}})>\delta\bigr\}. \tag{4.26}$$

From Proposition 3.3 we thus get

$$P\bigl(\langle\eta^D_{N,r},f(1-\chi_{n,\varepsilon})\rangle\neq 0\bigr)\le c\,\frac{|D_N\setminus D^n_{N,2\varepsilon}|^{1/2}}{N}. \tag{4.27}$$

For large-enough N, for every $x\in D_N\setminus D^n_{N,2\varepsilon}$ the set $N(D\setminus D^n_{3\varepsilon})$ will contain the open square of side-length one centered at x. It follows that $|D_N\setminus D^n_{N,2\varepsilon}|/N^2\le\mathrm{Leb}(D\setminus D^n_{3\varepsilon})$. The assumptions on D^n ensure that $\mathrm{Leb}(D\setminus D^n_{3\varepsilon})$, and thus also the right-hand side of (4.27), tend to zero as $\varepsilon\downarrow 0$ followed by $n\to\infty$. In conjunction with (4.25), this proves the claim. □

Our next step will consist of application of the Gibbs-Markov property.

Lemma 4.5 *For any $n\ge 1$, any $\varepsilon>0$ and any continuous function $f\colon\overline{D}\times\mathbb{R}\to[0,\infty)$ with compact support,*

$$\lim_{r\to\infty}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\Bigl|E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle\eta^D_{N,r},f\chi_{n,\varepsilon}\rangle}-E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle\eta^{D^n}_{N,r},f^{D,D^n}_{\varepsilon,\Phi}\rangle}\Bigr|=0. \tag{4.28}$$

Before we can start the formal proof, we need to make some preparatory steps. Consider the finite-N version of the function in (4.3):

$$f^{D,D^n}_{N,\varepsilon,\varphi}(x,h):=f\bigl(x,h+\varphi^{D,D^n}_N(\lfloor Nx\rfloor)\bigr)\chi_{n,\varepsilon}(x),\qquad(x,h)\in D^n\times\mathbb{R}. \tag{4.29}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}&\Bigl|E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle\eta^D_{N,r},f\chi_{n,\varepsilon}\rangle}-E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle\eta^{D^n}_{N,r},f^{D,D^n}_{\varepsilon,\Phi}\rangle}\Bigr|\\&\qquad\le\Bigl|E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle\eta^D_{N,r},f\chi_{n,\varepsilon}\rangle}-E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle\eta^{D^n}_{N,r},f^{D,D^n}_{N,\varepsilon,\varphi}\rangle}\Bigr|+\Bigl|E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle\eta^{D^n}_{N,r},f^{D,D^n}_{N,\varepsilon,\varphi}\rangle}-E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle\eta^{D^n}_{N,r},f^{D,D^n}_{\varepsilon,\Phi}\rangle}\Bigr|.\end{aligned} \tag{4.30}$$

Focusing on the first term on the right, by (4.22), (4.29) and Jensen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}&\Bigl|E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle\eta^D_{N,r},f\chi_{n,\varepsilon}\rangle}-E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle\eta^{D^n}_{N,r},f^{D,D^n}_{N,\varepsilon,\varphi}\rangle}\Bigr|\\&\qquad\le E\Bigl|\prod_{x\in\Theta^D_{N,r}}\mathrm{e}^{-f\bigl(x/N,h^D_N(x)-m_N\bigr)\chi_{n,\varepsilon}(x/N)}-\prod_{x\in\Theta^{D^n}_{N,r}}\mathrm{e}^{-f\bigl(x/N,h^D_N(x)-m_N\bigr)\chi_{n,\varepsilon}(x/N)}\Bigr|.\end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

Our strategy is to identify a set of asymptotically full measure on which we can derive a uniform estimate on the term in absolute value. That will in turn require establishing a one-to-one correspondence between the terms in the two products. This will then yield a good bound on the first term on the right of (4.30) as well.

We begin by identifying some exceptional events. Let the function f be as given and let $t_0>0$ be such that f is supported on $\overline{D}\cap[-t_0,\infty)$. Let $n\ge 1$ and $\varepsilon>0$ be fixed. Recall the set $D^n_{N,\delta}$ from (4.26). For $t>0$ and $M>0$ let

$$A^{(0)}_{N,t}:=\bigl\{\max_{x\in D^n_{N,\varepsilon/2}}|\varphi^{D,D^n}_N(x)|\ge t\bigr\}\quad\text{and}\quad A^{(1)}_{N,M,t}:=\bigl\{|\Gamma^{D^n}_N(t_0+2t)|>M\bigr\}. \tag{4.32}$$

Define also

$$A^{(2)}_{N,r,t} := \bigl\{\exists x,y\in\Gamma^{D^n}_N(t_0+2t)\colon\, r/2<|x-y|<N/r\bigr\} \tag{4.33}$$

and, recalling that $\Lambda_r(x):=\{y\in\mathbb{Z}^2\colon\,|x-y|\le r\}$, set

$$A^{(3)}_{N,r,t} := \bigl\{\exists x\in\Gamma^{D^n}_N(t_0+2t)\cap D^n_{N,\varepsilon/2},\,\exists y\in\Lambda_{2r}(x)\colon\,|\varphi^{D,D^n}_N(x)-\varphi^{D,D^n}_N(y)|>N^{-1/3}\bigr\}. \tag{4.34}$$

Abbreviate $A_{N,M,r,t}:=A^{(0)}_{N,t}\cup A^{(1)}_{N,M,t}\cup A^{(2)}_{N,r,t}\cup A^{(3)}_{N,r,t}$.

Lemma 4.6 *For f and t_0 as above,*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\limsup_{r\to\infty}\limsup_{M\to\infty}\limsup_{N\to\infty}P(A_{N,M,r,t})=0. \tag{4.35}$$

Proof. By Propositions 3.6, 3.1, and 3.2, we immediately have

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\limsup_{r\to\infty}\limsup_{M\to\infty}\limsup_{N\to\infty}P\bigl(A^{(0)}_{N,t}\cup A^{(1)}_{N,M,t}\cup A^{(2)}_{N,r,t}\bigr)=0. \tag{4.36}$$

Concerning the remaining event we note that, thanks to discrete harmonicity of C^{D,D^n}, the (discrete) Harnack inequality implies for any $r\ge 1$ once N is sufficiently large,

$$\max_{\substack{x\in D^n_{N,\varepsilon/2}\\ y\in\Lambda_{2r}(x)}}\operatorname{Var}\bigl(\varphi^{D,D^n}_N(x)-\varphi^{D,D^n}_N(y)\bigr)\le c(\varepsilon)r/N \tag{4.37}$$

for some $c(\varepsilon)<\infty$. By Proposition 3.5, the independence of φ^{D,D^n}_N of h^B_N, the fact that $A^{(1)}_{N,M,t}$ depends only on h^B_N, the Markov inequality and a union bound yield

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}P\bigl(A^{(3)}_{N,r,t}\bigl|(A^{(1)}_{N,M,t})^{\rm c}\bigr)=0, \tag{4.38}$$

for any M, r and t. Combining this with (4.36), the claim follows. □

Next we develop the correspondence between the relevant local maxima of $\eta^D_{N,r}$ and $\eta^{D^n}_{N,r}$. Thanks to our assumption on the support of f, only points in $\Gamma^D_N(t_0)\cap D^n_{N,\varepsilon/2}$ can possibly contribute to the products in (4.31). Hence it suffices to show:

Lemma 4.7 *Let $M>0$, $r\ge 1$ and $t>1$ be fixed. Then for all N large, on the event $(A_{N,M,r,t})^{\rm c}$, there is a map $q\colon\,\Theta^{D^n}_{N,r}\cap\Gamma^D_N(t_0+1)\cap D^n_{N,\varepsilon/2}\to\Theta^D_{N,r}$ such that*

(1) *q is injective,*
(2) *$q(\Theta^{D^n}_{N,r}\cap\Gamma^D_N(t_0+1)\cap D^n_{N,\varepsilon/2})\supseteq\Theta^D_{N,r}\cap\Gamma^D_N(t_0)\cap D^n_{N,\varepsilon}$,*

and, for all x for which $q(x)$ is defined,

(3) *$|q(x)-x|\le r$,*
(4) *$|h^D_N(q(x))-h^D_N(x)|\le N^{-1/3}$.*

Proof. We will need N so large that $N/r>2r$, $\varepsilon N>r$ and $N^{-1/3}<t$. Let us assume that $(A_{N,M,r,t})^{\rm c}$ occurs. We claim that then

$$x\in\Gamma^D_N(t_0+1)\cap D^n_{N,\varepsilon/2}\quad\Rightarrow\quad\begin{cases}\Lambda_{r/2}(x)\cap\Theta^D_{N,r}\ne\emptyset,\\ \Lambda_{r/2}(x)\cap\Theta^{D^n}_{N,r}\ne\emptyset.\end{cases} \tag{4.39}$$

Indeed, the containment in $(A_{N,M,r,t})^{\rm c}$ ensures the following:

(a) $h^D_N(x)\ge m_N-t_0-1$ and so $h^{D^n}_N(x)\ge m_N-(t_0+t+1)$,

(b) $h_N^D(y) < m_N - (t_0+t)$ for y such that $r/2 < |x-y| < N/r$,
(c) $|\varphi_N^{D,D^n}(y) - \varphi_N^{D,D^n}(x)| \le N^{-1/3}$ for $y \in \Lambda_{2r}(x)$.

Then (a) and (b) imply that $h_N^D(y) \le h_N^D(x) - t + 1 < h_N^D(x)$ for $y \in \Lambda_{2r}(x) \setminus \Lambda_{r/2}(x)$ and so the maximizer of h_N^D on $\Lambda_{2r}(x)$ lies in $\Lambda_{r/2}(x)$. This gives the top line in (4.39); for the bottom line we instead note that (a-c) give

$$h_N^{D^n}(y) \le h_N^{D^n}(x) + 1 - t + N^{-1/3} < h_N^{D^n}(x), \qquad y \in \Lambda_{2r}(x) \setminus \Lambda_{r/2}(x), \tag{4.40}$$

and the same conclusion holds for $h_N^{D^n}$ as well.

By the definition of r-local maximum, the sets on the right of (4.39) are singletons almost surely. Moreover, if $x \in \Gamma_N^D(t_0+1) \cap D_{N,\varepsilon/2}^n$ also lies in $\Theta_{N,r}^{D^n}$, then x is the (a.s.) unique element of $\Lambda_{r/2}(x) \cap \Theta_{N,r}^{D^n}$. We then define $q(x)$ to be the (a.s.) unique element of $\Lambda_{r/2}(x) \cap \Theta_{N,r}^D$. This implies (3) in the statement and shows (1) as well. To get (4), we note that $h_N^D(q(x)) - h_N^D(x)$ and $h_N^{D^n}(q(x)) - h_N^{D^n}(x)$ differ by at most $N^{-1/3}$ but, by the definition of r-local maximum and (3), they have opposite signs. So the bound in (4) must hold. To get also (2) we note that (4.39) ensures the existence of a point $x \in \Lambda_{r/2}(y) \cap \Theta_{N,r}^{D^n}$ for every $y \in \Theta_{N,r}^D \cap \Gamma_N^D(t_0) \cap D_{N,\varepsilon}^n$. Since $\varepsilon N > r$ and (4) holds, this x lies in $\Theta_{N,r}^{D^n} \cap \Gamma_N^D(t_0+1) \cap D_{N,\varepsilon/2}^n$ and so $q(x)$ is defined and $y = q(x)$ holds. □

We can now finally ready to prove the claim in (4.28):

Proof of Lemma 4.5. Recall the calculation in (4.30–4.31). We will focus on the expression in (4.31) first. Abbreviate

$$\Sigma_{N,r,\varepsilon}^{D^n} := \Theta_{N,r}^{D^n} \cap \Gamma_N^D(t_0+1) \cap D_{N,\varepsilon/2}^n. \tag{4.41}$$

Thanks to the restriction on the support of f and the presence of $\chi_{n,\varepsilon}$, we can freely restrict the second product to $x \in \Sigma_{N,r,\varepsilon}^{D^n}$. By Lemma 4.7, once N is large enough and $(A_{N,M,r,t})^{\mathrm{c}}$ occurs, all terms that effectively contribute to the first product lie in $q(\Sigma_{N,r,\varepsilon}^{D^n})$. Since q is also injective, we can write the first product over $q(\Sigma_{N,r,\varepsilon}^{D^n})$ and use the telescoping trick to write, on $(A_{N,M,r,t})^{\mathrm{c}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Bigl| \prod_{x\in\Theta_{N,r}^D} \mathrm{e}^{-f\bigl(x/N, h_N^D(x)-m_N\bigr)\chi_{n,\varepsilon}(x/N)} - \prod_{x\in\Theta_{N,r}^{D^n}} \mathrm{e}^{-f\bigl(x/N, h_N^D(x)-m_N\bigr)\chi_{n,\varepsilon}(x/N)} \Bigr| \\ \le \sum_{x\in\Sigma_{N,r,\varepsilon}^{D^n}} \Bigl| \mathrm{e}^{-f\bigl(q(x)/N, h_N^D(q(x))-m_N\bigr)\chi_{n,\varepsilon}(q(x)/N)} - \mathrm{e}^{-f\bigl(x/N, h_N^D(x)-m_N\bigr)\chi_{n,\varepsilon}(x/N)} \Bigr|.\end{aligned} \tag{4.42}$$

Let $\mathrm{osc}_{f\chi_{n,\varepsilon}}(\delta)$ denote the maximal oscillation of $f(x,h)\chi_{n,\varepsilon}(x)$ as either argument varies over an interval of length δ. On $(A_{N,M,r,t})^{\mathrm{c}}$ (and assuming $t \ge 1$) we have $|\Sigma_{N,r,\varepsilon}^{D^n}| \le M$ and, using parts (3-4) of Lemma 4.7, the sum is at most $M\,\mathrm{osc}_{f\chi_{n,\varepsilon}}(r/N + N^{-1/3})$. This tends to zero as $N \to \infty$; the expectation in (4.31) then tends to zero as $N \to \infty$ and $r \to \infty$ by Lemma 4.6.

It remains to address the second term in (4.30). Applying the definitions (4.22), (4.3), (4.29) we can rewrite this term as

$$\begin{aligned}\Bigl| E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle \eta_{N,r}^{D^n}, f_{N,\varepsilon,\varphi}^{D,D^n}\rangle} - E\mathrm{e}^{-\langle \eta_{N,r}^{D^n}, f_{\varepsilon,\Phi}^{D,D^n}\rangle} \Bigr| \\ = \Bigl| E \prod_{x\in\Theta_{N,r}^{D^n}} \mathrm{e}^{-f\bigl(x/N, h_N^{D^n}(x)-m_N+\varphi_N^{D,D^n}(x)\bigr)\chi_{n,\varepsilon}(x/N)} \\ - E \prod_{x\in\Theta_{N,r}^{D^n}} \mathrm{e}^{-f\bigl(x/N, h_N^{D^n}(x)-m_N+\Phi^{D,D^n}(x/N)\bigr)\chi_{n,\varepsilon}(x/N)} \Bigr|\end{aligned} \tag{4.43}$$

Now recall the event $A^{(0)}_{N,t}$ from (4.32). Due to our restriction on the support of f, on $(A^{(0)}_{N,t})^{\rm c}$ we can restrict the first product to $x \in \Theta^{D^n}_{N,r} \cap \Gamma^{D^n}(t_0+t)$. Similarly, on the complement of

$$\tilde{A}^{(0)}_{N,t} := \bigl\{ \max_{x \in D^n_{N,\varepsilon/2}} \Phi^{D,D^n}(x/N) > t \bigr\} \tag{4.44}$$

the second product can also be restricted to $x \in \Theta^{D^n}_{N,r} \cap \Gamma^{D^n}_N(t_0+t)$ as well. Introducing an additional restriction on the size of $\Gamma^{D^n}_N(t_0+t)$, we use the telescopic trick again to get

$$\begin{aligned} \Bigl| E{\rm e}^{-\langle \eta^{D^n}_{N,r}, f^{D,D^n}_{N,\varepsilon,\varphi}\rangle} - E{\rm e}^{-\langle \eta^{D^n}_{N,r}, f^{D,D^n}_{\varepsilon,\Phi}\rangle} \Bigr| &\le P\bigl(A^{(0)}_{N,t}\bigr) + P\bigl(\tilde{A}^{(0)}_{N,t}\bigr) + P\bigl(|\Gamma^{D^n}_N(t)| > M\bigr) \\ &+ E\Biggl(1_{\{|\Gamma^{D^n}_N(t_0+t)| \le M\}} \sum_{x \in \Theta^{D^n}_{N,r} \cap \Gamma^{D^n}_N(t_0+t)} \widetilde{E} \Bigl| {\rm e}^{-f\bigl(x/N, h^{D^n}_N(x) - m_N + \varphi^{D,D^n}_N(x)\bigr)\chi_{n,\varepsilon}(x/N)} \\ &\qquad - {\rm e}^{-f\bigl(x/N, h^{D^n}_N(x) - m_N + \Phi^{D,D^n}(x/N)\bigr)\chi_{n,\varepsilon}(x/N)} \Bigr| \Biggr), \end{aligned} \tag{4.45}$$

where the inner expectation $\widetilde{E}$ is over any coupling of the random variables

$$\bigl\{ (\varphi^{D,D^n}_N(x), \Phi^{D,D^n}(x/N)) \colon x \in \Theta^{D^n}_{N,r} \cap \Gamma^{D^n}_N(t_0+t) \bigr\} \tag{4.46}$$

with the correct marginal laws, conditioned on $h^{D^n}_N$. Since there are at most M random variables in this collection, for any $\delta > 0$, Proposition 3.5 ensures the existence of a coupling such that $|\varphi^{D,D^n}_N(x) - \Phi^{D,D^n}(x/N)| < \delta$ for all $x \in \Theta^{D^n}_{N,r} \cap \Gamma^{D^n}_N(t_0+t) \cap D^n_{N,\varepsilon}$ with probability at least $1-\delta$ once N is large. Hence, the $N \to \infty$ limit of the last term on the right of (4.45) is again at most $M(\delta + {\rm osc}_{f\chi_{n,\varepsilon}}(\delta))$ for any $\delta > 0$. As the three probabilities on the right of (4.45) tend to zero as $N \to \infty$, $t \to \infty$ and $M \to \infty$, the claim is proved. □

Proof of Proposition 4.1. The claim follows readily from Lemmas 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5. □

5. MAXIMIZER CONDITIONED ON LARGE MAXIMUM

The goal of this section is to establish Theorem 2.6 dealing with the asymptotic distribution of the maximizer of h^D_N conditional on the maximum being atypically large. Here and henceforth, the term "square" designates the set of the form $(a,a+r)\times(b,b+r)$ for $a,b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r > 0$.

5.1 Reduction to squares.

Our strategy is to deduce Theorem 2.6 from the following statement (adapted to our notation) that was proved for square domains in Bramson, Ding and Zeitouni [16]:

Proposition 5.1 (Proposition 2.2 of [16]) *Consider the square $S := (0,1)^2$ and recall that we have $\alpha := 2/\sqrt{g} = \sqrt{2\pi}$ in our normalization. There exists a constant $a_\star \in (0,\infty)$ such that*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \limsup_{N\to\infty} \Bigl| \frac{1}{t} {\rm e}^{\alpha t} P\Bigl(\max_{x \in S_N} h^S_N(x) > m_N + t \Bigr) - a_\star \Bigr| = 0. \tag{5.1}$$

Moreover, there exists a probability density ψ on $[0,1]^2$ such that for any open set $A \subset [0,1]^2$,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \limsup_{N\to\infty} \Bigl| P\Bigl(N^{-1} \operatorname*{argmax}_{S_N} h^S_N \in A \,\Big|\, \max_{x\in S_N} h^S_N(x) > m_N + t \Bigr) - \int_A \psi(x){\rm d}x \Bigr| = 0. \tag{5.2}$$

Thanks to the results of Bramson, Ding and Zeitouni [16] and Biskup and Louidor [9], we in fact know that the $N\to\infty$ limits in (5.1–5.2) in fact exist. Moreover, the conclusions readily generalize to squares of all sizes. Explicitly, for $S:=a+(0,K)^2$ with $K>0$ rational and $a\in\mathbb{Q}^2$, reducing to a subsequence of N's for which $KN\in\mathbb{N}$ and noting that $m_{KN}=m_N+2\sqrt{g}\log K+o(1)$ as $N\to\infty$ yields (for any $A\subset D$ open) that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{t}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha t}P\Bigl(N^{-1}\operatorname*{argmax}_{S_N}h_N^S\in A\,,\,\max_{x\in S_N}h_N^S(x)>m_N+t\Bigr)=\int_A\psi^S(x)\mathrm{d}x, \tag{5.3}$$

where $\psi^S(x):=a_\star K^2\psi((x-a)/K)$. Thus, (2.13) holds for squares of rational sizes. Squares of irrational sizes are handled by straightforward approximations and Proposition 3.3. Note that that $\psi^S(x)$ is invariant under a simultaneous shift of both x and S.

Our goal is to extend (5.3) to all $D\in\mathfrak{D}$. More importantly, we also aim to establish the formula (2.14) for the corresponding density ψ^D. The reduction step is encapsulated into the following claim:

Proposition 5.2 *Let $D\in\mathfrak{D}$ and suppose that A is a non-empty open set and S,S' open squares such that $\overline{A}\subset S'$ and $\overline{S'}\subset S\subset D$. Regard h_N^D as defined by $h_N^D:=h_N^S+\varphi_N^{D,S}$ with h_N^S and $\varphi_N^{D,S}$ independent and let $\hat{X}_N^D$, resp., $\hat{X}_N^S$ be the maximizers of h_N^D, resp., h_N^S on D_N, resp., S_N. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{M\to\infty}\limsup_{t\to\infty}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\biggl|&P\Bigl(\hat{X}_N^D\in A_N,\max_{x\in D_N}h_N^D>m_N+t\Bigr)\\&-P\Bigl(\hat{X}_N^S\in A_N,h_N^D(\hat{X}_N^S)>m_N+t,\max_{x\in S_N'}|\varphi_N^{D,S}(x)|\le M\Bigr)\biggr|\frac{1}{t}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha t}\;=\;0\,.\end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

Postponing the proof of this proposition until the next subsection, we move to:

Proof of Theorem 2.6. Let $D\in\mathfrak{D}$. We begin by showing the existence of a function ψ^D such that (2.13) holds. In light of Proposition 3.3 and the additivity in A of both sides of (2.13), it suffices to prove the claim for all open sets $A\subset D$ so small that there are open squares S,S' for which $\overline{A}\subset S'$ and $\overline{S'}\subset S\subset D$ hold. We will assume these sets to be fixed for the duration of the argument.

Consider a tiling of $\mathbb{R}^2$ by open squares of side $1/K$ and let $S^i\colon i=1,\dots,n_K$ denote those squares entirely contained in A. We assume that K is so large that $n_K\ge1$. Let S_N^i denote the scaled up version of S^i by N and note that $S_N^i\cap S_N^j=\emptyset$ for $i\ne j$. Denote

$$\varphi_{N,i}^{\min}:=\min_{z\in S_N^i}\varphi_N^{D,S}(z),\qquad i=1,\dots,n_K. \tag{5.5}$$

Since the maximizer of h_N^S is a.s. unique, the Gibbs-Markov property shows

$$\begin{aligned}&P\Bigl(\hat{X}_N^S\in A_N,h_N^D(\hat{X}_N^S)>m_N+t,\max_{x\in S_N'}|\varphi_N^{D,S}(x)|\le M\Bigr)\\&\qquad\ge\sum_{i=1}^{n_K}P\Bigl(\hat{X}_N^S\in A_N\cap S_N^i,h_N^D(\hat{X}_N^S)>m_N+t,\max_{x\in S_N'}|\varphi_N^{D,S}(x)|\le M\Bigr)\\&\qquad\ge\sum_{i=1}^{n_K}P\Bigl(\hat{X}_N^S\in A_N\cap S_N^i,h_N^S(\hat{X}_N^S)>m_N+t-\varphi_{N,i}^{\min},\max_{x\in S_N'}|\varphi_N^{D,S}(x)|\le M\Bigr).\end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

As n_K does not depend on N or t, we may assume that the corresponding version of (5.3) holds for all n_K squares uniformly. Moreover, the distributional convergence $\varphi_N^{D,S}\xrightarrow{\text{law}}\Phi^{D,S}$ takes place

uniformly on S' and so we can couple $\varphi_N^{D,S}$ and $\Phi^{D,S}$ on the same probability space such that $\max_{x\in S'_N}|\varphi_N^{D,S}(x)-\Phi^{D,S}(x/N)|=o(1)$ as $N\to\infty$. Using these facts, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{t\to\infty}\liminf_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{t}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha t}P\Bigl(\hat X_N^S\in A_N, h_N^D(\hat X_N^S)>m_N+t, \max_{x\in S'_N}|\varphi_N^{D,S}(x)|\le M\Bigr)\\ \ge\sum_{i=1}^{n_K}\Bigl(\int_{A\cap S^i}\psi^S(x)\mathrm{d}x\Bigr)E\Bigl(\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi_i^{D,S}}1_{\{\sup_{S'}|\Phi^{D,S}|<M\}}\Bigr),\end{aligned}\tag{5.7}$$

where $\Phi_i^{D,S}:=\inf_{x\in S^i}\Phi^{D,S}(x)$. Writing the right-hand side as one integral and using the Bounded Convergence Theorem and the a.s. continuity of $\Phi^{D,S}$ on S' to take $K\to\infty$, we get the integral of $\psi^S(x)$ against the expectation of $\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,S}(x)}$ on the event where $\sup_{S'}|\Phi^{D,S}|<M$. In the limit $M\to\infty$, the Monotone Convergence Theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{M\to\infty}\liminf_{t\to\infty}\liminf_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{t}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha t}P\Bigl(\hat X_N^S\in A_N, h_N^D(\hat X_N^S)>m_N+t, \max_{x\in S'_N}|\varphi_N^{D,S}(x)|\le M\Bigr)\\ \ge\int_A\psi^S(x)\mathrm{e}^{\frac12\alpha^2\mathrm{Var}(\Phi^{D,S}(x))}\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned}\tag{5.8}$$

A completely analogous argument using squares of side-length $1/K$ that overlap slightly and cover A gives us, in conjunction with Proposition 3.3 and the fact that ∂A has zero Lebesgue measure, an identical upper bound with *limes superior* replacing *limes inferior* in all three cases. Based on (5.4) we then conclude (2.13) with

$$\psi^D(x):=\psi^S(x)\mathrm{e}^{\frac12\alpha^2\mathrm{Var}(\Phi^{D,S}(x))},\qquad x\in S.\tag{5.9}$$

It remains to identify ψ^D explicitly.

Pick $D\in\mathfrak{D}$ and recall that (2.8) gives $\mathrm{Var}(\Phi^{D,S}(x))$ as the difference $F^D(x)-F^S(x)$, where we have temporarily denoted

$$F^D(x):=g\int_{\partial D}\Pi^D(x,\mathrm{d}z)\log|z-y|.\tag{5.10}$$

It follows that

$$\psi^D(x)\mathrm{e}^{-\frac12\alpha^2gF^D(x)}=\psi^S(x)\mathrm{e}^{-\frac12\alpha^2gF^S(x)},\qquad x\in S.\tag{5.11}$$

We claim that the quantity on the left is the same for all $x\in D$. Indeed, if $x,x'\in D$ are two points, choose S to be a square centered at x and S' a square of the same size centered at x' such that $S,S'\subset D$. The joint shift invariance in x and S of both $\psi^S(x)$ and $F^S(x)$ implies that the right-hand side of (5.11) is the same for both x and x'. Hence, so is the left-hand side.

Writing $C_\star$ for the common value of the quantity in (5.11), we infer

$$\psi^D(x)=C_\star\mathrm{e}^{\frac12\alpha^2gF^D(x)},\qquad x\in D.\tag{5.12}$$

Since $\alpha^2g=4$ (regardless of the value of g), this gives us (2.14). □

We prove also the corresponding conclusion for the Z^D-measure:

Proof of Corollary 2.7. Let $A\subseteq D$ be open and let t be related to λ via $\lambda=\frac{1}{\alpha}\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha t}$. Let η^D be the limit process in domain D and let $(x^\star,h^\star)$ be the point with the largest value of the field coordinate. Then, as observed in Biskup and Louidor [9],

$$P\bigl(x^\star\in A, h^\star\le t\bigr)=E\bigl(\widehat Z^D(A)(1-\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda Z^D(D)})\bigr).\tag{5.13}$$

Noting that $\lambda\log(1/\lambda) = te^{-\alpha t}$, the asymptotic (2.15) follows from Theorem 2.6, the distributional convergence in Theorem 2.1 and some simple approximation arguments.

Concerning (2.16), we pick $\theta \in (0,1)$ and observe

$$E\big(\widehat{Z}^D(A)(e^{-\theta\lambda Z^D(D)} - e^{-\lambda Z^D(D)})\big) = \lambda\int_\theta^1 E\big(Z^D(A)e^{-s\lambda Z^D(D)}\big)ds. \tag{5.14}$$

Straightforward estimates of the exponent on the right hand side then yield

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda(1-\theta)&E\big(Z^D(A)e^{-\lambda Z^D(D)}\big)\\ &\le E\big(\widehat{Z}^D(A)(e^{-\theta\lambda Z^D(D)} - e^{-\lambda Z^D(D)})\big)\\ &\le \lambda(1-\theta)E\big(Z^D(A)e^{-\theta\lambda Z^D(D)}\big).\end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

Thanks to (2.15), in the limit as $\lambda \downarrow 0$ the middle expression is asymptotic to $(1-\theta)\lambda\log(1/\lambda)$ times the integral of ψ^D over A. The claim follows by taking $\theta \downarrow 0$. □

5.2 Proof of Proposition 5.2.

We begin by noting that inserting the restriction on the size of the field $\varphi_N^{D,S}$ on S'_N comes at no significant cost even under the small-probability event that the maximum is large:

Lemma 5.3 *For sets S, S', D as in Proposition 5.2 above,*

$$\lim_{M\to\infty}\limsup_{t\to\infty}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{t}e^{\alpha t}P\Big(\hat{X}_N^D \in S'_N\cap\Gamma_N^D(-t), \max_{x\in S'_N}|\varphi_N^{D,S}(x)| > M\Big) = 0. \tag{5.16}$$

Proof. Thanks to the fact that S' is separated from S^c by a positive distance, Proposition 3.6 yields

$$P\Big(\max_{x\in S'_N}|\varphi_N^{D,S}(x)| > M\Big) \le ce^{-c'M^2} \tag{5.17}$$

for some $c, c' \in (0,\infty)$ and all $N \ge 1$. This means we can immediately discard the event that the maximum $|\varphi_N^{D,S}(x)|$ exceeds, say, $t^{2/3}$. For the complementary event, note that the Gibbs-Markov decomposition $h_N^D = h_N^S + \varphi_N^{D,S}$ on S implies

$$\begin{aligned}P\Big(\hat{X}_N^D \in S'_N\cap\Gamma_N^D(-t), M < \max_{x\in S'_N}|\varphi_N^{D,S}(x)| < t^{2/3}\Big)&\\ \le \sum_{M\le L\le t^{2/3}} P\Big(\hat{X}_N^D \in S'_N, \max_{x\in D_N}h_N^D(x) > m_N + t,\ L < \max_{x\in S'_N}|\varphi_N^{D,S}(x)| \le L+1\Big)&\\ \le \sum_{M\le L\le t^{2/3}} P\Big(\max_{x\in S'_N}h_N^S(x) > m_N + t - L - 1, \max_{x\in S'_N}|\varphi_N^{D,S}(x)| > L\Big).&\end{aligned} \tag{5.18}$$

Using that the two events in the last line are independent and applying (5.1) and (5.17), the *limes superior* as $N\to\infty$ of the last probability is bounded by $te^{-\alpha t}$ times $c''e^{\alpha L - c'L^2}$ for some $c', c'' \in (0,\infty)$. The latter is summable on $L \ge M$ uniformly in t. The claim follows. □

Our proof of Proposition 5.2 will make a repeated use of the fact that, conditional on an exceptionally high value for the global maximum of h_N^D, all other extreme local maxima of h_N^D are considerably smaller.

Lemma 5.4 *Let $D \in \mathfrak{D}$. For any function $s\colon [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ obeying $s(t) \le t$ and $t - s(t) = o(t)$ as $t \to \infty$,*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \lim_{r\to\infty} \limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathrm{e}^{\alpha t} P\Bigl(\exists x \in \Gamma_N^D(-t),\, \exists y \in \Gamma_N^D(-s(t))\colon\, |x-y| > r\Bigr) = 0\,. \tag{5.19}$$

Proof. After some straighforward arguments, the proof reduces to a question about asymptotic for the Laplace transform of the total mass of the Z^D-measure. However, since the relevant facts we need from Z^D have not yet been established for general D, but are known for squares, we first reduce the whole problem to a square domain.

Let S be an open square containing D. Let $H^D_{N,r,t}$ denote the event in (5.19) for domain D and field h^D_N and let $H^S_{N,r,t}$ denote the event for domain S with the field $h^S_N := h^D_N + \varphi^{S,D}_N$. On $H^D_{N,r,t}$, let $(x^\star, y^\star)$ be the vertices realizing the event that are chosen according to some *a priori* ordering of all pairs; otherwise, let $(x^\star, y^\star)$ be just the first pair. Then

$$H^S_{N,r,t} \supseteq H^D_{N,r,t} \cap \bigl\{\varphi^{S,D}_N(x^\star) \ge 0,\, \varphi^{S,D}_N(y^\star) \ge 0\bigr\}. \tag{5.20}$$

Now observe (similarly as in the proof of Lemma 3.4) that the second event is independent of the first and has probability at least $1/4$. Hence we get $P(H^D_{N,r,t}) \le 4P(H^S_{N,r,t})$ and it thus suffices to prove the result for open squares.

So suppose that D is an open square. For any $r_N \to \infty$ with $r_N/N \to 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} H^D_{N,r,t} \subseteq \bigl\{\exists x,y \in \Gamma_N(s)\colon\, r \le |x-y| < r_N\bigr\} \\ \cup \bigl\{\eta^D_{N,r_N}(D\times[t,\infty)) \ge 1,\, \eta^D_{N,r_N}(D\times[s(t),\infty)) \ge 2\bigr\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

holds once N is sufficiently large. In the limit as $N \to \infty$ and $r \to \infty$, the probability of the first event on the right tends to zero by Proposition 3.2 while the second event has an interpretation in terms of the limit η^D of point processes $\{\eta^D_{N,r_N}\}$. In particular, it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathrm{e}^{\alpha t} P\Bigl(\eta^D\bigl(D\times[t,\infty)\bigr) \ge 1, \eta^D\bigl(D\times[s(t),\infty)\bigr) \ge 2\Bigr) = 0 \tag{5.22}$$

for any square domain D.

We will first write the event in (5.22) as the set difference

$$\Bigl\{\eta^D\bigl(D\times[t,\infty)\bigr) \ge 1\Bigr\} \smallsetminus \Bigl\{\eta^D\bigl(D\times[t,\infty)\bigr) = 1,\, \eta^D\bigl(D\times[s(t),t)\bigr) = 0\Bigr\} \tag{5.23}$$

and note that the second event is a subset of the first and so the probability of their set-difference is the difference of their probabilities. Thanks to Theorem 1.1 of Biskup and Louidor [9], the process η^D is Poisson with intensity $Z(\mathrm{d}x) \otimes \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha h}\mathrm{d}h$. As the spatial coordinate of the points is not restrained in the above events, only the total mass $Z := Z^D(D)$ matters. Abbreviating $\lambda := \frac{1}{\alpha}\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha t}$ and $\lambda' := \frac{1}{\alpha}\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha s(t)}$, (5.23) and the fact that $\{\eta^D(D\times[t,\infty)) = 1\}$ and $\{\eta^D(D\times[s(t),t)) = 0\}$ are independent allows us to write

$$P\Bigl(\eta^D\bigl(D\times[t,\infty)\bigr) \ge 1, \eta^D\bigl(D\times[s(t),\infty)\bigr) \ge 2\Bigr) = E\bigl(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda Z} - \lambda Z \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda' Z}\bigr). \tag{5.24}$$

The key point is that, for square domains, the asymptotic for λ, λ' small of the expression on the right is known. Indeed, Lemma 3.5 from [9] gives

$$E\bigl(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda Z}\bigr) = \bigl[1 + o(1)\bigr] c\lambda \log(1/\lambda), \qquad \lambda \downarrow 0, \tag{5.25}$$

and

$$E\bigl(Ze^{-\lambda Z}\bigr) = \bigl[1+o(1)\bigr]c\log(1/\lambda), \qquad \lambda \downarrow 0, \tag{5.26}$$

for some constant $c \in (0,\infty)$. (In fact, for unit square we get $c := a_\star$ where $a_\star$ is as in Proposition 5.1.) Interpreting this back using t and $s(t)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} P\Bigl(\eta^D\bigl(D\times[t,\infty)\bigr) \ge 1, \eta^D\bigl(D\times[s(t),\infty)\bigr) \ge 2\Bigr) \\ = \bigl[c+o(1)\bigr]\,te^{-\alpha t} - \bigl[c+o(1)\bigr]\,s(t)e^{-\alpha t}, \qquad t, s(t) \to \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{5.27}$$

Under our assumptions on $s(t)$, this tends to zero as $t\to\infty$ even after multiplication by $t^{-1}e^{\alpha t}$. □

Notwithstanding our previous reduction to square domains in the previous proof, Proposition 5.2 still requires at least a bound on the Laplace transform of the total mass of Z^D.

Lemma 5.5 *For each $D \in \mathfrak{D}$, there is $c>0$ such that for all $\lambda>0$ small enough,*

$$E\bigl(1-e^{-\lambda Z^D(D)}\bigr) \le c\lambda\log\tfrac{1}{\lambda}\,. \tag{5.28}$$

Proof. By Theorem 2.1 and some simple approximation arguments, the expectation on the left is the limit of the probability that $\max_{x\in D_N} h_N^D(x) > m_N + t$, where $\lambda := \frac{1}{\alpha}e^{-\alpha t}$. The claim follows from, e.g., Proposition 3.3. □

Proof of Proposition 5.2. For general $A \subset D$ define

$$\hat{X}_N^{D,A} := \operatorname*{argmax}_{A_N} h_N^D \tag{5.29}$$

and note that $\hat{X}_N^{D,D} = \hat{X}_N^D$. Consider sets $A \subset S \subset S' \subset D$ as in the statement. Writing the event in the first probability on the left-hand side of (5.4) as $\{\hat{X}_N^D \in A_N \cap \Gamma_N^D(-t)\}$, our goal is to simply replace $\hat{X}_N^D$ by $\hat{X}_N^S$. We will do this by the sequence of replacements

$$\hat{X}_N^D \longrightarrow \hat{X}_N^{D,S'} \longrightarrow \hat{X}_N^{S,S'} \longrightarrow \hat{X}_N^S. \tag{5.30}$$

Each of the arrows will constitute a STEP as designated below. Note that we can freely intersect the primary event with

$$F_{N,M} := \bigl\{\max_{x\in S'_N} |\varphi_N^{D,S}(x)| \le M\bigr\}, \tag{5.31}$$

as the complementary event can be dismissed (in the limit $M\to\infty$) thanks to Lemma 5.3. To keep our expressions short, we introduce the (sub-probability) measure $P_{N,M}$ by

$$P_{N,M}(E) := P(E\cap F_{N,M}). \tag{5.32}$$

We now proceed with the actual proof.

STEP 1: Our task to replace $\hat{X}_N^D$ by $\hat{X}_N^{D,S'}$ in the above event. Here we note that $\hat{X}_N^D \in A_N\cap\Gamma_N^D(-t)$ implies $\hat{X}_N^{D,S'} = X_N^D$ (because $A\subset S'$) and thus

$$\bigl\{\hat{X}_N^D \in A_N\cap\Gamma_N^D(-t)\bigr\} \subseteq \bigl\{\hat{X}_N^{D,S'} \in A_N\cap\Gamma_N^D(-t)\bigr\}. \tag{5.33}$$

On the difference of the two events, the maximizer of h_N^D on S'_N lies in A_N but the absolute maximizer lies in $D_N\setminus S'_N$. As $\mathrm{d}(A,(S')^{\mathrm{c}})>0$, the difference is for large enough N contained in

the event from (5.19) with $s(t) := t$. Hence

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathrm{e}^{\alpha t} \Big| P_{N,M}\big(\hat{X}_N^D \in A_N \cap \Gamma_N^D(-t)\big) - P_{N,M}\big(\hat{X}_N^{D,S'} \in A_N \cap \Gamma_N^D(-t)\big)\Big| = 0 \tag{5.34}$$

by Lemma 5.4.

STEP 2: Our next goal is to substitute $\hat{X}_N^{D,S'}$ by $\hat{X}_N^{S,S'}$ in $\{\hat{X}_N^{D,S'} \in A_N \cap \Gamma_N^D(-t)\} \cap F_{N,M}$. First we observe that these two points cannot be too far from each other. Indeed, on $F_{N,M}$

$$h_N^D(\hat{X}_N^{S,S'}) \geq h_N^S(\hat{X}_N^{S,S'}) - M \geq h_N^S(\hat{X}_N^{D,S'}) - M \geq h_N^D(\hat{X}_N^{D,S'}) - 2M \tag{5.35}$$

and so $\hat{X}_N^{D,S'} \in \Gamma_N^D(-t)$ and $|\hat{X}_N^{D,S'} - \hat{X}_N^{S,S'}| > r$ imply the occurrence of the event in (5.19) with $s(t) := t - 2M$. Hence,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \lim_{r\to\infty} \limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathrm{e}^{\alpha t} P_{N,M}\Big(\hat{X}_N^{D,S'} \in \Gamma_N^D(-t),\, |\hat{X}_N^{D,S'} - \hat{X}_N^{S,S'}| > r\Big) = 0. \tag{5.36}$$

Moving to the cases when $|\hat{X}_N^{D,S'} - \hat{X}_N^{S,S'}| \leq r$, the fact that $\varphi_N^{D,S}$ is discrete harmonic on the square S_N and bounded by M on S_N' implies

$$\big|\varphi_N^{D,S}(x) - \varphi_N^{D,S}(y)\big| \leq cM\frac{|x-y|}{N}, \qquad x,y \in S_N', \tag{5.37}$$

for some constant $c \in (0,\infty)$ independent of N and M. So once $|\hat{X}_N^{D,S'} - \hat{X}_N^{S,S'}| \leq r$,

$$0 \leq h_N^D(\hat{X}_N^{D,S'}) - h_N^D(\hat{X}_N^{S,S'}) \leq cM\frac{r}{N}. \tag{5.38}$$

It follows that the part of the symmetric difference

$$\big\{\hat{X}_N^{D,S'} \in A_N \cap \Gamma_N^D(-t)\big\} \triangle \big\{\hat{X}_N^{S,S'} \in A_N \cap \Gamma_N^D(-t)\big\} \tag{5.39}$$

that belongs to $F_{N,M} \cap \{|\hat{X}_N^{D,S'} - \hat{X}_N^{S,S'}| \leq r\}$ is contained in the union

$$\big\{\exists x \in A_N \cap \Gamma_N^D(-t)\colon \mathrm{d}(x, A_N^{\mathrm{c}}) \leq r\big\} \cup \big\{\max_{x\in S_N'} h_N^D(x) \in [m_N + t, m_N + t + cMr/N]\big\}. \tag{5.40}$$

Since $|\partial A|$ has zero Lebesgue measure, Proposition 3.3 ensures

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \lim_{r\to\infty} \limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathrm{e}^{\alpha t} P\big(\exists x \in A_N \cap \Gamma_N^D(-t)\colon \mathrm{d}(x, A_N^{\mathrm{c}}) \leq r\big) = 0. \tag{5.41}$$

Similarly, the convergence to the Cox process established in Theorem 2.1 along with the fact that $Z^D(\partial S') = 0$ a.s. implies, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} P\big(\max_{x\in S_N'} h_N^D(x) \in [m_N + t, m_N + t + \varepsilon]\big) \leq E\big(\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\varepsilon} Z} - \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda Z}\big), \tag{5.42}$$

where we used the shorthands $Z := Z^D(S')$ and $\lambda := \frac{1}{\alpha}\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha t}$. The right-hand side is further bounded by $E(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda(1-\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\varepsilon})Z})$. Applying Lemma 5.5 (and $Z^D(S') \leq Z^D(D)$), for $\varepsilon > 0$ fixed this decays as a constant times $t\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha t}(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\varepsilon})$ as $t \to \infty$. Taking $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, the probability in (5.42) thus tends to zero even after multiplication by $t^{-1}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha t}$. Combining with (5.36), we have derived

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \lim_{r\to\infty} \limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathrm{e}^{\alpha t} \Big| P_{N,M}\big(\hat{X}_N^{D,S'} \in A_N \cap \Gamma_N^D(-t)\big) - P_{N,M}\big(\hat{X}_N^{S,S'} \in A_N \cap \Gamma_N^D(-t)\big)\Big| = 0 \tag{5.43}$$

and thus completed STEP 2.

STEP 3: Our final task is to replace $\hat{X}_N^{S,S'}$ by $\hat{X}_N^S$. Here we note that if $\hat{X}_N^S \in S'_N$ then $\hat{X}_N^S = \hat{X}_N^{S,S'}$ and so the difference of events $\{X_N^S \in A_N \cap \Gamma_N^D(-t)\}$ and $\{X_N^{S,S'} \in A_N \cap \Gamma_N^D(-t)\}$ implies, on $F_{N,M}$, the event in (4.1) with $s(t) := t - M$. Lemma 5.4 yields

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \lim_{r\to\infty} \limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathrm{e}^{\alpha t} \Big| P_{N,M}\big(\hat{X}_N^{S,S'} \in A_N \cap \Gamma_N^D(-t)\big) - P_{N,M}\big(\hat{X}_N^S \in A_N \cap \Gamma_N^D(-t)\big) \Big| = 0. \quad (5.44)$$

The desired claim now follows by combining (5.34), (5.43) and (5.44) with Lemma 5.3. □

6. Representation via a derivative martingale

As noted before, our proofs proceed in a slightly different order from this point on than the statements of the results. Indeed, our next goal is to prove Theorem 2.8 deferring the proof of conformal-transformation rule from Theorem 2.5 to the next section.

6.1 Uniqueness and derivative martingale.

The proof of Theorem 2.8 will be based on a representation of measure M^D in the statement as a weak limit of derivative-martingale like expressions that depend, as far as random objects are concerned, only on a single Gaussian field. A representation of this kind was put forward already in Theorem 1.4 of Biskup and Louidor [9] but the derivations there were based on specific facts about the DGFF on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ while here we have a continuum problem from the outset.

Given a domain $D \in \mathfrak{D}$ and an integer $K \geq 1$, consider a tiling of $\mathbb{C}$ by equilateral triangles of side-length K^{-1} with vertices lying on a triangular lattice of mesh K^{-1}. Let $D^1, \dots, D^{m_K}$ denote the (open) triangles that lie entirely in D and abbreviate

$$\widetilde{D} := \bigcup_{i=1}^{m_K} D^i. \quad (6.1)$$

Note that $\widetilde{D}$ depends on D and K, although we do not make this notationally explicit. Given a $\delta \in (0,1)$, let us assume that indices $i = 1, \dots, n_K$, for some $n_K \leq m_K$, enumerate those triangles that are at least distance δ away from $\mathbb{C} \setminus D$ and let $D_\delta^1, \dots, D_\delta^{n_K}$ denote the equilateral triangles of side length $(1-\delta)K^{-1}$ with the same orientation and centers as $D^1, \dots, D^{n_K}$, respectively. Recall the definition

$$\mathrm{osc}_A f := \sup_{x\in A} f(x) - \inf_{x\in A} f(x) \quad (6.2)$$

of oscillation of a function f on a set A. Then we have:

Theorem 6.1 *Recall that $\alpha := 2/\sqrt{g}$ and consider the events*

$$A_{K,R}^i := \big\{\mathrm{osc}_{D_\delta^i} \Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}} \leq R\big\} \cap \big\{\max_{D_\delta^i} \Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}} \leq 2\sqrt{g}\log K - R\big\}, \qquad i = 1, \dots, n_K. \quad (6.3)$$

Then for any family $\{M^D : D \in \mathfrak{D}\}$ of random Borel measures satisfying conditions (0-4) of Theorem 2.8 and any $D \in \mathfrak{D}$, the random measure

$$\alpha \psi^D(x) \sum_{i=1}^{n_K} 1_{A_{K,R}^i} \big(\alpha \mathrm{Var}(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)) - \Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)\big) \mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x) - \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 \mathrm{Var}(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x))} 1_{D_\delta^i}(x)\, \mathrm{d}x \quad (6.4)$$



FIG 3. An illustration of domain $\widetilde{D}$ (the shaded triangles) for D as in Fig. 1. The interior of the union of the closures of these triangles is domain D' used later in this section.

tends in law to M^D in the limit as $K \to \infty$, $R \to \infty$ and $\delta \downarrow 0$ (in this order). (Note that this holds irrespective of the orientation of the triangular grid.)

The representation (6.4) immediately yields:

Proof of Theorem 2.8. In light of Theorem 2.4 and Corollary 2.7, the family $\{Z^D\colon D \in \mathfrak{D}\}$ constructed in Theorem 2.1 obeys conditions (0-4) of Theorem 2.8. By Theorem 6.1, these properties determine the law of $\{Z^D\colon D \in \mathfrak{D}\}$ uniquely. □

Remark 6.2 Note that $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ is the projection of the CGFF on D onto the set of functions that are piece-wise harmonic on each of the triangles that falls entirely inside D. Hence, albeit decorated by truncations and other restrictions, the measure in (6.4) has the anticipated form of ψ^D-multiple of a derivative martingale. Note, however, that this class of projections leads to a very different filtration of the probability space than used by Duplantier, Rhodes, Sheffield and Vargas [24, 25]. This is one reason why a direct connection to their constructions is hard to make.

Assume $\{M^D\colon D \in \mathfrak{D}\}$ and $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ are statistically-independent realizations of the corresponding processes and suppose throughout the rest of this section that the conditions (0-4) in Theorem 2.8 hold. The proof of Theorem 6.1 opens up by noting that

$$1_{\widetilde{D}}(x)M^D(\mathrm{d}x) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{n_K} \mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)} M^{D^i}(\mathrm{d}x) \tag{6.5}$$

holds. This is thanks to the Gibbs-Markov property (property (3) in Theorem 2.8). As the next proposition shows, the restriction of the measure on the left to $\widetilde{D}$ is immaterial:

Proposition 6.3 *For each $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\limsup_{K\to\infty} P\biggl(M^D\Bigl(D\smallsetminus\bigcup_{i=1}^{n_K} D^i_\delta\Bigr) > \varepsilon\biggr) = 0. \tag{6.6}$$

Focussing now on the right-hand side of the expression in (6.5), our derivations will require restrictions on irregularity of the field $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$; in particular, we need a bound on the maximal value and oscillation of the field in individual triangles. This is the content of the following propositions (recall again that $\widetilde{D}$ depends on K and δ):

Proposition 6.4 *Let x^i_0 denote the center of the triangle D^i. There is $\zeta > 0$ such that, for each $\delta > 0$*

$$\limsup_{K\to\infty} P\bigl(\max_{i=1,\dots,n_K}\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x^i_0) > 2\sqrt{g}\log K - \zeta\log\log K\bigr) = 0. \tag{6.7}$$

Proposition 6.5 *For any $\delta\in(0,1)$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\lim_{R\to\infty}\limsup_{K\to\infty} P\Bigl(\sum_{i=1}^{n_K}\int_{D^i_\delta} M^{D^i}(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)}1_{\{\mathrm{osc}_{D^i_\delta}\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}>R\}} > \varepsilon\Bigr) = 0. \tag{6.8}$$

As a final ingredient, we will need to control the small-argument asymptotic of the Laplace transform of the integral of M^D against an equicontinuous class functions. This will be based on the tail assumption in part (4) of Theorem 2.8. Fortunately, we will only need this for one domain; namely, the equilateral triangle T of side-length 1 centered at 0 and oriented consistently with the above triangular cover of $\mathbb{C}$.

Let T_δ be the triangle of side-length $1-\delta$ centered and oriented same as T. Given $\beta > 0$ and $R > 0$ let $\mathscr{F}_{R,\beta,\delta}$ denote the class of continuous functions $f\colon\overline{T}\to\mathbb{R}$ such that,

$$f(x)\geq\beta \quad\text{and}\quad |f(x)-f(y)|\leq R|x-y|, \qquad x,y\in\overline{T}_\delta. \tag{6.9}$$

Then we have:

Proposition 6.6 *Fix $\beta > 0$ and $R > 0$. For each $\varepsilon > 0$ there are $\delta_0 > 0$ and $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that, for all $\lambda\in(0,\lambda_0)$, all $\delta\in(0,\delta_0)$ and all $f\in\mathscr{F}_{R,\beta,\delta}$,*

$$(1-\varepsilon)\int_{T_\delta} f(x)\psi^T(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \leq \frac{\log E(\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda M^T(f1_{T_\delta})})}{\lambda\log\lambda} \leq (1+\varepsilon)\int_{T_\delta} f(x)\psi^T(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \tag{6.10}$$

where we abbreviated $M^T(f1_{T_\delta}) := \int_{T_\delta} M^T(\mathrm{d}x)\,f(x)$.

Deferring temporarily the proof of all four propositions, we can now prove the derivative-martingale like representation in (6.4):

Proof of Theorem 6.1. In light of (6.5) and the above propositions, the random measure

$$M^D_{K,R,\delta}(\mathrm{d}x) := \sum_{i=1}^{n_K} 1_{A^i_{K,R}}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)}1_{D^i_\delta}(x)\,M^{D^i}(\mathrm{d}x) \tag{6.11}$$

tends weakly to M^D in the stated limits. Pick some $f\colon\overline{D}\to[0,\infty)$ bounded and continuous and assume $f\geq\beta$ on D for some $\beta > 0$. Writing $M^D_{K,R,\delta}(f)$ for the integral of f with respect to

$M^D_{K,R,\delta}$, (6.11) reads

$$E\bigl(\mathrm{e}^{-M^D_{K,R,\delta}(f)}\bigr) = E\biggl(\prod_{\substack{i=1,\dots,n_K\\ A^i_{K,R}\text{ occurs}}} \exp\Bigl\{-\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x^i_0)} M^{D^i}\bigl(f1_{D^i_\delta}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}-\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x^i_0))}\bigr)\Bigr\}\biggr). \tag{6.12}$$

Whenever $A^i_{K,R}$ occurs, we have

$$\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x^i_0)} \le \mathrm{e}^{\alpha 2\sqrt{g}\log K - \alpha\zeta\log\log K} = K^4(\log K)^{-\alpha\zeta} \tag{6.13}$$

and

$$\bigl|\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x) - \Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x^i_0))\bigr| \le R, \qquad x\in D^i_\delta. \tag{6.14}$$

Since $x\mapsto\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)$ is harmonic on D^i and f is, being a member of $\mathscr{F}_{R,\beta,\delta}$, uniformly continuous and positive, for all realizations of $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ satisfying (6.13–6.14) the function

$$g(z) := f\bigl(x^i_0 + K^{-1}z\bigr)\mathrm{e}^{\alpha(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x^i_0+z/K)-\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x^i_0))} \tag{6.15}$$

lies in $\mathscr{F}_{R',\beta',\delta}$ for some suitable R' and β' that depend only on R and β. The scaling property (2) tells us that $K^4M^{D^i}(K^{-1}\mathrm{d}x)$ has the law of a shifted M^T. Proposition 6.6 with $\lambda := K^{-4}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x^i_0)}$ then implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\exp\biggl\{(1+\varepsilon)K^{-4}\log\bigl(K^{-4}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x^i_0)}\bigr)\int_{D^i_\delta} f(x)\,K^4\psi^{D^i}(x)\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)}\,\mathrm{d}x\biggr\}\\
&\quad\le E\biggl(\exp\Bigl\{-\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x^i_0)}M^{D^i}\bigl(f1_{D^i_\delta}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}-\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x^i_0))}\bigr)\Bigr\}\,\Bigm|\,\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}\biggr)\\
&\qquad\le \exp\biggl\{(1-\varepsilon)K^{-4}\log\bigl(K^{-4}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x^i_0)}\bigr)\int_{D^i_\delta} f(x)\,K^4\psi^{D^i}(x)\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)}\,\mathrm{d}x\biggr\}
\end{aligned} \tag{6.16}$$

whenever $A^i_{K,R}$ holds, K is sufficiently large and δ is sufficiently small, uniformly in $i=1,\dots,n_K$. Here the factor K^4 inside the integral arises from scaling (and shifting) the measure $\psi^T(x)\mathrm{d}x$ on the unit triangle T to the triangle D^i of side-length K^{-1}.

In order to convert the expression in the exponentials on both sides of (6.16) into the desirable form, we will absorb the term $\log(K^{-4}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x^i_0)})$ into the integral and turn it into the expression $\alpha(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)-\alpha\mathrm{Var}(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)))$. For this we first note (cf Lemma 6.7) that

$$\mathrm{Var}\bigl(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)\bigr) = g\log K + O(1), \qquad x\in D^i_\delta. \tag{6.17}$$

As $\alpha^2 g = 4$, assuming that $A^i_{K,R}$ occurs, this and (6.14) permit us to write,

$$\log(K^{-4}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x^i_0)}) = \alpha\bigl(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x) - \alpha\mathrm{Var}(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x))\bigr) + O(1), \tag{6.18}$$

where the $O(1)$ term is bounded uniformly in $x\in D^i_\delta$. But $\log(K^{-4}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x^i_0)})$ is order $\log\log K$ on $A^i_{K,R}$ and so the $O(1)$ term can be absorbed at the cost of changing $(1\pm\varepsilon)$ into $(1\pm 2\varepsilon)$. Denoting the measure in (6.4) by $\widetilde{Z}^D_{K,R,\delta}$ and recalling that

$$\psi^{D^i}(x) = \psi^D(x)\mathrm{e}^{-\frac12\alpha^2\mathrm{Var}(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x))}, \qquad x\in D^i, \tag{6.19}$$

(see, e.g., (5.12)) we thus get

$$E\big(\mathrm{e}^{-(1+\varepsilon)\widetilde{Z}^D_{K,R,\delta}(f)}\big) \le E\big(\mathrm{e}^{-M^D_{K,R,\delta}(f)}\big) \le E\big(\mathrm{e}^{-(1-\varepsilon)\widetilde{Z}^D_{K,R,\delta}(f)}\big). \tag{6.20}$$

In particular, since ε was arbitrary, $\widetilde{Z}^D_{K,R,\delta}(f) \xrightarrow{\text{law}} M^D(f)$ in the stated limits for any bounded and continuous function $f\colon \overline{D} \to \mathbb{R}$ with $f \ge \beta$. But β was arbitrary and such functions are dense in the space of all bounded and continuous functions and so the claim follows. □

6.2 Proofs of key propositions.

We are left with the proof of the above four propositions. We begin with those that are easier:

Proof of Proposition 6.3. Let us temporarily write $\widetilde{D}_{K,\delta}$ instead of just $\widetilde{D}$. Suppose the claim fails. Then there are sequences $K_n \to \infty$ and $\delta_n \downarrow 0$, the latter exponentially decaying, such that $\liminf_{n\to\infty} P(M^D(D \smallsetminus \widetilde{D}_{K_n,\delta_n}) > \varepsilon) > \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Now $\mathrm{Leb}(D \smallsetminus \widetilde{D}_{K_n,\delta_n}) = O(\delta_n)$ and so $B_m := \bigcup_{n\ge m}(D \smallsetminus D_{K_n,\delta_n})$ obeys $\mathrm{Leb}(B_m) \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$. By $D \smallsetminus \widetilde{D}_{K_n,\delta_n} \subseteq B_n$ and B_n is decreasing and so $P(M^D(B_n) > \varepsilon) > \varepsilon$ for all $n \ge 1$. But this contradicts the stochastic absolute continuity assumption because $B_\infty := \bigcap_{n\ge1} B_n$ has zero Lebesgue measure and yet non-zero M^D measure with positive probability. The claim follows. □

For the second proposition, and also later reference, we need to control the variance of $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ and some linear combinations thereof:

Lemma 6.7 *For each $\delta \in (0,1)$ there is $c(\delta) < \infty$ such that*

$$\sup_{K\ge1} \max_{i=1,\dots,n_K} \sup_{x\in D^i_\delta} \Big|\mathrm{Var}\big(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)\big) - g\log K\Big| \le c(\delta) \tag{6.21}$$

and

$$\sup_{K\ge1} \max_{i,j=1,\dots,n_K} \sup_{x,y\in D^i_\delta} \sup_{z\in D^j_\delta} \mathrm{Cov}\big(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(z), \Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(y) - \Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x))\big) \le c(\delta). \tag{6.22}$$

In fact, we even have

$$\sup_{K\ge1} \max_{i=1,\dots,n_K} \sup_{\substack{x,y\in D^i_\delta \\ x\ne y}} \frac{E\big((\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x) - \Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(y))^2\big)}{K^{-1}|x-y|} \le c(\delta). \tag{6.23}$$

Proof. Recall that $C^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x,y)$ denotes the covariance of the Gaussian field $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$. Using that the harmonic measure is normalized to one, we rewrite (2.8) as

$$C^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x,y) = \int_{\partial D\times\partial\widetilde{D}} \Pi^D(x,\mathrm{d}z) \otimes \Pi^{\widetilde{D}}(x,\mathrm{d}\tilde{z}) \log\frac{|y-z|}{|y-\tilde{z}|}. \tag{6.24}$$

To get (6.21) we now evaluate this for $y = x \in D^i_\delta$ and note that, given any $z \in \partial D$ and $\tilde{z} \in \partial D^i_\delta$, the ratio $\frac{|x-\tilde{z}|}{|x-z|}$ is bounded between a constant times δ/K and a constant times $1/(\delta K)$. (The constant depends on the diameter of D but not on K.)

For (6.22) and (6.23) we pick $x,y \in D^i_\delta$, $z \in D^j_\delta$ and rewrite (2.8) as

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Cov}\bigl(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(z), \Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x) - \Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(y)\bigr)\bigr) \\ = \int_{\partial D} \Pi^D(z,\mathrm{d}u) \log\frac{|x-u|}{|y-u|} - \int_{\partial\widetilde{D}} \Pi^{\widetilde{D}}(z,\mathrm{d}u) \log\frac{|x-u|}{|y-u|}.\end{aligned} \tag{6.25}$$

Given any $u \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{x\}$, the triangle inequality shows

$$\left|\frac{|y-u|}{|x-u|} - 1\right| \le \frac{|x-y|}{|x-u|}. \tag{6.26}$$

Noting that, for any $u \in \partial D$ or $u \in \partial\widetilde{D}$ and some constants $c, c' \in (0,\infty)$,

$$\frac{|x-y|}{|x-u|} \le c\frac{K}{\delta}|x-y| \le \frac{c'}{\delta}, \tag{6.27}$$

both (6.22) and (6.23) follow. □

Proof of Proposition 6.4. Thanks to (6.21), the standard Gaussian estimate and some simple algebra show

$$P\bigl(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x^i_0) > 2\sqrt{g}\log K - R\bigr) \le \frac{c}{\sqrt{\log K}} K^{-2}\,\mathrm{e}^{\alpha R} \tag{6.28}$$

for some constant $c > 0$, uniformly in $i = 1,\dots,n_K$ and R such that $0 \le R \le \sqrt{g}\log K$. As there are only order K^2 points to control, the claim follows by a union bound. □

The proof of Proposition 6.6, dealing with the measure M^T on the triangle T of unit length, is somewhat more involved. The argument naturally splits into two parts the first of which is the content of the following claim:

Lemma 6.8 *Fix $\beta > 0$ and $R > 0$. For each $\varepsilon > 0$ there are $\delta_0 > 0$ and $\lambda_1 > 0$ such that, for all $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_1)$, all $\delta \in (0,\delta_0)$ and all $f \in \mathscr{F}_{R,\beta,\delta}$,*

$$(1-\varepsilon)\int_{T_\delta} f(x)\psi^T(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \le \frac{E(M^T(f1_{T_\delta})\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda M^T(T)})}{\log(1/\lambda)} \le (1+\varepsilon)\int_{T_\delta} f(x)\psi^T(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \tag{6.29}$$

Proof. Fix $\beta > 0$ and $R > 0$ and, given an $\varepsilon > 0$, partition T into K^2 triangles $\{T_i\colon i = 1,\dots,K^2\}$ of side K^{-1}, where $R/K \le \varepsilon$. Thanks to our assumption that condition (2) in Theorem 2.8 holds, we may find $\lambda_1 > 0$ such that

$$(1-\varepsilon)\int_{T_i} \psi^T(x)\mathrm{d}x \le \frac{E\bigl(M^T(T_i)\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda M^T(T)}\bigr)}{\log(1/\lambda)} \le (1+\varepsilon)\int_{T_i} \psi^T(x)\mathrm{d}x \tag{6.30}$$

is true for all $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_1)$ and all $i = 1,\dots,K^2$.

Now let f be a function such that (6.9) holds and observe that, since $f \ge 0$ we necessarily have $f \le R$. Thanks to the Lipschitz estimate in (6.9), we may then approximate f from above

and below by a function f_K that is constant on each T_i and $|f_K - f| \le \varepsilon$. Then (6.30) gives

$$\begin{aligned} E\bigl(M^T(f1_{T_\delta})\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda M^T(T)}\bigr) &\le E\bigl(M^T(f_K+\varepsilon)\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda M^T(T)}\bigr) \\ &\le \log(1/\lambda)\sum_{i=1}^{K^2}(1+\varepsilon)\int_{T_i}\psi^T(x)\bigl(f_K(x)+\varepsilon\bigr)\mathrm{d}x \\ &\le \log(1/\lambda)(1+\varepsilon)\int_T \psi^T(x)\bigl(f(x)+2\varepsilon\bigr)\mathrm{d}x \end{aligned} \tag{6.31}$$

as soon as $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_1)$. For the corresponding lower bound we assume that $2\varepsilon \in (0,\beta)$; a similar derivation then yields

$$\frac{E\bigl(M^T(f1_{T_\delta})\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda M^T(T)}\bigr)}{\log(1/\lambda)} \ge (1-\varepsilon)\int_{T'_\delta}\psi^T(x)\bigl(f(x)-2\varepsilon\bigr)\mathrm{d}x, \tag{6.32}$$

where T'_δ is the union of all T_i's that lie entirely in T_δ. Since the integral of ψ^T is finite and positive and f is bounded below and above by constants that depend only on β and R, respectively, the claim follows by choosing δ sufficiently small and K large enough. □

Proof of Proposition 6.6. We will relate the quantity in the statement to that in Lemma 6.8. Pick $f\colon T \to [0,\infty)$ with $f(x) \le R$. For the upper bound we note

$$\begin{aligned} \log E\bigl(\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda M^T(f)}\bigr) &= -\lambda\int_0^1 \frac{E(M^T(f)\mathrm{e}^{-s\lambda M^T(f)})}{E(\mathrm{e}^{-s\lambda M^T(f)})}\,\mathrm{d}s \\ &\le -\lambda E(M^T(f)\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda R M^T(T)}), \end{aligned} \tag{6.33}$$

where we first bounded the denominator in the integrand by one and then estimated the exponent in the numerator from above by $\lambda M^T(T)$ times the absolute maximum of f. Invoking the upper bound in Lemma 6.8 for f replaced by $f1_{T_\delta}$, we get the upper bound in the claim as soon as $\lambda_0 \le \lambda_1/R$.

For the corresponding lower bound, pick $a > 0$ and write

$$\begin{aligned} E\bigl(\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda M^T(f)}\bigr) &\ge E\bigl(\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda M^T(f)-\lambda a M^T(T)}\bigr) \\ &\ge E\bigl(\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda a M^T(T)}\bigr)\exp\biggl\{-\lambda\frac{E(M^T(f)\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda a M^T(T)})}{E(\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda a M^T(T)})}\biggr\} \end{aligned} \tag{6.34}$$

where the second bound follows by Jensen's inequality for exponential function. Since the logarithm of the first term on the right is order $a\lambda\log(1/\lambda)$, the claim again follows from Lemma 6.8 with ε replaced by, say, $\varepsilon/2$ provided a is chosen sufficiently small and $\lambda_0 \le \lambda_1 a$. □

Proposition 6.5 is hardest to prove and is the sole reason why we work with triangular partitions. In order to explain this, let D' denote the interior of $\bigcup_{i=1}^{m_K}\overline{D^i}$. Then

$$\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}} \overset{\text{law}}{=} \Phi^{D,D'} + \Phi^{D',\widetilde{D}} \tag{6.35}$$

with the last two fields independent. Next we recall that the field $\Phi^{D',\widetilde{D}}$ can be thought of as a projection of the CGFF on D' onto the space of (piece-wise) harmonic functions on $\widetilde{D}$. This space of harmonic functions contains the linear subspace $\mathscr{H}^{\triangle}$ of all continuous piece-wise linear functions with zero boundary conditions on $\partial D'$. Thus, $\Phi^{D,D'}$ further splits into a sum of independent Gaussian fields, $\Phi^{\triangle}+\Phi^{\perp}$, where $\Phi^{\triangle}$ is the projection of $\Phi^{D',\widetilde{D}}$ on $\mathscr{H}^{\triangle}$ while $\Phi^{\perp}$ is the

corresponding projection onto the orthogonal complement thereof. Combining with the above formula, we thus have

$$\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}} \overset{\text{law}}{=} \Phi^{D,D'} + \Phi^{\triangle} + \Phi^{\perp}, \tag{6.36}$$

with all three fields on the right independent. An important technical point for us is that, thanks to an observation that goes back to Sheffield [37], $\Phi^{\triangle}$ can be represented as a linear extension of the DGFF on the triangular grid.

We start with some estimates on the variances of the various involved fields. The first one of these, $\Phi^{D,D'}$, can be dealt with using Proposition 3.7 so let us move directly to the "rough" field $\Phi^{\perp}$. Here we get:

Lemma 6.9 *For each $\delta > 0$ there is $c(\delta) < \infty$ such that*

$$\sup_{K\geq 1} \max_{i=1,\dots,n_K} \sup_{x\in D^i_\delta} \operatorname{Var}\bigl(\Phi^{\perp}(x)\bigr) \leq c(\delta) \tag{6.37}$$

The proof of this claim requires somewhat unpleasant computations and so we postpone it temporarily in order to keep attention focussed on the main part of the argument. We will nonetheless record an immediate corollary:

Corollary 6.10 *Denote*

$$\varepsilon_R := \sup_{K\geq 1} \max_{i=1,\dots,n_K} \sup_{x\in D^i_\delta} E\bigl(\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{\perp}(x)} 1_{\{\operatorname{osc}_{D^i_\delta}\Phi^{\perp} > R\}}\bigr). \tag{6.38}$$

Then $\lim_{R\to\infty}\varepsilon_R = 0$.

Proof. Thanks to the independence of $\Phi^{D,D'}+\Phi^{\triangle}$ and $\Phi^{\perp}$, the bound (6.23) applies equally well to $\Phi^{\perp}$ instead of $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$. This makes the Fernique criterion available which, in conjunction with the Borell-Tsirelson inequality (enabled by Lemma 6.9), then shows that $\sup_{x\in D^i_\delta}|\Phi^{\perp}(x)|$ has Gaussian tails uniformly in $K\geq 1$ and $i=1,\dots,n_K$. Bounding both $\Phi^{\perp}(x)$ and $\operatorname{osc}_{D^i_\delta}\Phi^{\perp}$ in terms of $\sup_{x\in D^i_\delta}|\Phi^{\perp}(x)|$ and applying the exponential Chebyshev inequality, we get the claim. □

The above estimates will be particularly useful thanks to the following observation:

Lemma 6.11 *Let $Y \overset{\text{law}}{=} \mathcal{N}(0, 100c(\delta))$ be independent of $\Phi^{\triangle}$. Then for any $x,y\in\bigcup_{i=1}^n D^i_\delta$,*

$$\operatorname{Cov}\bigl(\Phi^{\triangle}(x)+Y, \Phi^{\triangle}(y)+Y\bigr) \geq \operatorname{Cov}\bigl(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x), \Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(y)\bigr). \tag{6.39}$$

Similarly, setting $\Psi^{\triangle}(x) := \Phi^{\triangle}(x) + \Phi^{\triangle}(x^i_0+a) - \Phi^{\triangle}(x^i_0+b)$ whenever $x\in D^i_\delta$, once δ is small enough, we have

$$\operatorname{Cov}\bigl(\Psi^{\triangle}(x)+Y, \Psi^{\triangle}(y)+Y\bigr) \geq \operatorname{Cov}\bigl(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x), \Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(y)\bigr), \tag{6.40}$$

for any $x,y\in\bigcup_{i=1}^n D^i_\delta$ and any a,b with $|a|,|b|\leq\frac14 K^{-1}$.

Proof. first note that by the first part of Proposition 3.7, $\operatorname{Var}(\Phi^{D,D'}(x)) \leq c(\delta)$ uniformly in $x\in\bigcup_{i=1}^n D^i_\delta$ and $K\geq 1$. Using also Lemma 6.9, the bounds (6.22–6.23) in Lemma 6.7 apply with $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ replaced by $\Phi^{\triangle}$ (and $c(\delta)$ multiplied by a numerical constant).

Now assume, without loss of generality that Y, is independent of $\Phi^{\triangle}$, $\Phi^{\perp}$ and $\Phi^{D,D'}$. Then (6.36) and Lemma 6.9 imply

$$\mathrm{Cov}\big(\Phi^{\triangle}(x)+Y,\Phi^{\triangle}(y)+Y\big)\geq \mathrm{Cov}\big(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x),\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(y)\big)+2c(\delta). \tag{6.41}$$

This immediately gives the first part of the claim. For the second part, we write the covariance using covariances of $\Phi^{\triangle}$ and then apply (6.22–6.23). □

Proof of Proposition 6.5. In light of the second part of Proposition 3.7, for any $\delta>0$,

$$\mathrm{osc}_{\bigcup_{i=1}^{n_K} D^i_\delta}\Phi^{D,D'} \underset{K\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \tag{6.42}$$

in probability. This means that (at the cost of modifying R slightly) we can replace the event $\{\mathrm{osc}_{D^i_\delta}\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}>R\}$ by the union of the corresponding events (with R replaced by $R/2$) for the fields $\Phi^{\triangle}$ and $\Phi^{\perp}$. Invoking a union bound, we may then study the contributions of triangles where these events occur separately.

Let us first address the contribution coming from high oscillations of the field $\Phi^{\perp}$. Define

$$M^{\perp}_{K,R}:=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\int_{D^i_\delta}M^{D^i}(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)}1_{\{\mathrm{osc}_{D^i_\delta}\Phi^{\perp}>R\}}. \tag{6.43}$$

Then, by the fact that $\Phi^{D,D'}+\Phi^{\perp}$ and $\Phi^{\triangle}$ are independent and using Jensen's inequality,

$$E\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda M^{\perp}_{K,R}}\geq E\bigg(\exp\Big\{-\lambda\sum_{i=1}^{n}\int_{D^i_\delta}M^{D^i}(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{\triangle}(x)}E\big(\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{\perp}(x)}1_{\{\mathrm{osc}_{D^i_\delta}\Phi^{\perp}>R\}}\big)\Big\}\bigg). \tag{6.44}$$

Recall that the inner expectation is bounded by the quantity ε_R in (6.38).

Let now $Y\overset{\text{law}}{=}\mathcal{N}(0,100c(\delta))$ be independent of $\Phi^{\perp}$, $\Phi^{\triangle}$ and the M^{D^i}'s. The first claim in Lemma 6.11 permits us to use Kahane's convexity inequality (see Proposition 3.8) to conclude

$$\begin{aligned}E\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda\mathrm{e}^{\alpha Y}M^{\perp}_{K,R}}&\geq E\bigg(\exp\Big\{-\lambda\varepsilon_R\sum_{i=1}^{n}\int_{D^i_\delta}M^{D^i}(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{\triangle}(x)+\alpha Y}\Big\}\bigg).\\&\geq E\bigg(\exp\Big\{-\lambda\,\varepsilon_R\mathrm{e}^{\frac{3}{2}\alpha^2c(\delta)}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\int_{D^i_\delta}M^{D^i}(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)}\Big\}\bigg)\\&\geq E\bigg(\exp\Big\{-\lambda\,\varepsilon_R\mathrm{e}^{\frac{3}{2}\alpha^2c(\delta)}M^{D}(D)\Big\}\bigg),\end{aligned} \tag{6.45}$$

where we also used that $\mathrm{Var}(\Phi^{\triangle}(x))\leq\mathrm{Var}(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x))$. The right-hand side is independent of K and it tends to zero as $R\to\infty$ since $M^D(D)<\infty$ a.s. and $\varepsilon_R\to 0$. As Y is a fixed random variable independent of $M^{\perp}_{K,R}$, it follows that $M^{\perp}_{K,R}\to 0$ in probability as $K\to\infty$ and $R\to\infty$.

Next let us move to contributions coming from high oscillations of $\Phi^{\triangle}$. Since $\Phi^{\triangle}$ is linear on every triangle, to control its oscillation it suffices to control its value at three distinct points. For δ small enough, the distance of x^i_0 to the boundary of D^i_δ is at least $\frac{1}{4}K^{-1}$. For each a,b with $|a|,|b|\leq\frac{1}{4}K^{-1}$ we have $x^i_0+a,x^i_0+b\in D^i_\delta$ and so it makes sense to define

$$M^{\triangle}_{K,R}(a,b):=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\int_{D^i_\delta}M^{D^i}(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)}1_{\{\Phi^{\triangle}(x^i_0+a)-\Phi^{\perp}(x^i_0+b)>R\}} \tag{6.46}$$

Using Jensen's inequality to eliminate the field $\Phi^{D,D'}+\Phi^{\perp}$ as before, we obtain

$$E\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda M^{\triangle}_{K,R}(a,b)} \geq E\biggl(\exp\Bigl\{-\lambda \mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 c(\delta)}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\int_{D^i_\delta} M^{D^i}(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{\triangle}(x)}1_{\{\Phi^{\triangle}(x^i_0+a)-\Phi^{\perp}(x^i_0+b)>R\}}\Bigr\}\biggr). \tag{6.47}$$

The Markov inequality then shows

$$E\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda M^{\triangle}_{K,R}(a,b)} \geq E\biggl(\exp\Bigl\{-\lambda \mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{4}c(\delta)-\alpha R}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\int_{D^i_\delta} M^{D^i}(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Psi(x)}\Bigr\}\biggr). \tag{6.48}$$

where we recalled $\Psi^{\triangle}(x):=\Phi^{\triangle}(x)+\Phi^{\triangle}(x^i_0+a)-\Phi^{\triangle}(x^i_0+b)$ once $x\in D^i_\delta$. Applying again Kahane's estimate from Proposition 3.8 with the help of the second claim in Lemma 6.11, we thus get

$$E\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda \mathrm{e}^{\alpha Y} M^{\triangle}_{K,R}(a,b)} \geq E\biggl(\exp\Bigl\{-\lambda c'(\delta)\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha R}M^{D}(D)\Bigr\}\biggr) \tag{6.49}$$

for some $c'(\delta)<\infty$. Notice that this gives us the convergence $M^{\triangle}_{K,R}(a,b)\to 0$ in probability as $K\to\infty$ and $R\to\infty$ uniformly in the allowed a,b.

Now let a_1,a_2,a_3 be the points marking the third-roots of unity. The intersection of the event in (6.8) with the event $\{M^{\perp}_{K,R/2}\leq \varepsilon/2\}$ is then contained in

$$\bigcup_{1\leq i<j\leq 3}\bigl\{M^{\triangle}_{K,R/20}(a_i 2^{-K-2},a_j 2^{-K-2})>\varepsilon/6\bigr\}. \tag{6.50}$$

By (6.49), each of these three events has probability tending to zero as $K\to\infty$ and $R\to\infty$. Since also $M^{\perp}_{K,R}\to 0$ in probability in this limit, the claim follows. □

6.3 Variance of $\Phi^{\perp}$.

For the proof of Proposition 6.6 to be complete, it remains to check the uniform boundedness of the variance of the field $\Phi^{\perp}$.

Proof of Lemma 6.9. The independence of $\Phi^{\triangle}$ and $\Phi^{\perp}$ implies

$$\mathrm{Var}\bigl(\Phi^{\perp}(x)\bigr)=\mathrm{Var}\bigl(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)\bigr)-\mathrm{Var}\bigl(\Phi^{\triangle}(x)\bigr)-\mathrm{Var}\bigl(\Phi^{D,D'}(x)\bigr) \tag{6.51}$$

and so, in light of the first part of Proposition 3.7, it suffices to show that the first two variances on the right differ only by a universal constant. Lemma 6.7 gives

$$\mathrm{Var}\bigl(\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)\bigr)\leq g\log K+c_1 \tag{6.52}$$

for all $x\in\bigcup_{i=1}^{n_K}D^i_\delta$. It thus suffices to show that

$$\mathrm{Var}\bigl(\Phi^{\triangle}(x)\bigr)\geq g\log K-c_2 \tag{6.53}$$

for some $c_2<\infty$ and all $x\in\bigcup_{i=1}^{n_K}D^i_\delta$.

Let $\mathbb{T}_K$ denote the set of the vertices in the triangles constituting $\widetilde{D}$; we think of $\mathbb{T}_K$ as a subgraph of the triangular lattice of mesh size K^{-1}. Let $\partial^\star\mathbb{T}_K$ denote *inner* boundary of $\mathbb{T}_K$; these are the vertices that lie in $\partial D'$. Abusing our notations slightly, let Φ^K denote the restriction of $\Phi^{\triangle}$ to the points in $\mathbb{T}_K$. As observed in Sheffield [37, Section 4.2], Φ^K is distributed as $3^{1/4}$ times the DGFF on $\mathbb{T}_K$ with 0 boundary values on $\partial^\star\mathbb{T}_K$. More precisely, in our normalization

(which differs from Sheffield by a factor $1/4$) the density of Φ^K with respect to the Lebesgue measure is proportional to

$$\exp\Big\{-\tfrac{1}{8}\tfrac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\|\nabla\varphi\|_2^2\Big\} = \exp\Big\{-\tfrac{1}{8}\tfrac{6}{\sqrt{3}}\big\langle\varphi,-\tfrac{1}{6}\Delta\varphi\big\rangle\Big\} = \exp\Big\{-\tfrac{1}{2}\tfrac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\big\langle\varphi,G_K^{-1}\varphi\big\rangle\Big\}. \tag{6.54}$$

Here $\langle f,g\rangle$, resp., $\|f\|_2$ denotes the inner product, resp., the norm in $\ell^2(\mathbb{T}_K)$ with respect to the counting measure, Δ is the discrete Laplace operator on $\mathbb{T}_K$, and $\frac{1}{6}\Delta$ is thus the generator of the simple random walk on $\mathbb{T}_K$. Finally, $G_K := (-\frac{1}{6}\Delta)^{-1}$ is the Green operator with 0 boundary conditions on $\partial^\star\mathbb{T}_K$.

Based on the above reasoning, it follows that

$$\mathrm{Cov}\big(\Phi^K(x),\Phi^K(y)\big) = (2/\sqrt{3})G_K(x,y), \qquad x,y\in\mathbb{T}_K. \tag{6.55}$$

Letting $a(x)$ denote the potential kernel associated with the simple random walk on the triangular lattice $\mathbb{T}$ of unit mesh size and writing $H^{\mathbb{T}_K}(x,\cdot)$ to denote the harmonic measure on $\partial^\star\mathbb{T}_K$ for the random walk on $\mathbb{T}_K$ started from x, standard discrete potential theory shows

$$G_K(x,y) = \sum_{z\in\partial^\star\mathbb{T}_K} a\big(K(z-y)\big)H^{\mathbb{T}_K}(x,z) - a\big(K(x-y)\big)\,. \tag{6.56}$$

For the harmonic potential on the triangular lattice (or other lattice as well), Theorem 1 from Kozma and Schreiber [28] gives the asymptotic

$$a(w) \underset{|w|\to\infty}{\sim} \tau\log|w|\,, \quad \text{where} \quad \tau := \frac{\mathrm{vol}(\mathbb{T})}{\pi|\det\Sigma|^{1/2}}\,, \tag{6.57}$$

for $|w|$ denoting the Euclidean norm of w,

$$\mathrm{vol}(\mathbb{T}) := \lim_{r\to\infty}\frac{\mathrm{Leb}(B(0,r))}{|B(0,r)\cap\mathbb{T}|} \tag{6.58}$$

expressing the comparison of volumes of the Euclidean ball $B(0,r)$ of radius r centered at 0 with the number of vertices of $\mathbb{T}$ contained therein and Σ denoting the covariance matrix of the single step distribution of the random walk (regarded as a random variable in $\mathbb{R}^2$). A straightforward calculation now shows

$$\mathrm{vol}(\mathbb{T}) = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \det\Sigma = \frac{1}{4} \tag{6.59}$$

and so $\tau = \sqrt{3}/\pi$.

Now let $u,v\in\mathbb{T}_K\cap\overline{D^i}$ for some $i\in\{1,\dots,n_K\}$. Then the lattice distance of these points from $\partial^\star\mathbb{T}_K$ is at least order δK and so, as $K\to\infty$, the asymptotic (6.57) can be used. Combining (6.55) with (6.57) and (6.59), we thus get

$$\mathrm{Cov}\big(\Phi^K(u),\Phi^K(v)\big) \ge \frac{\sqrt{3}}{\pi}\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}\log K - c \tag{6.60}$$

for some $c = c(\delta) < \infty$. If $\{u,v,w\}$ are the vertices in $\mathbb{T}_K\cap\overline{D^i}$ for some $i\in\{1,\dots,n_K\}$, then every $x\in D^i$ can be written as $x = \alpha_1 u + \alpha_2 v + \alpha_3 w$ for some nonnegative numbers $\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3$ that add up to 1. The piece-wise linearity of $\Phi^\triangle$ then implies that $\Phi^\triangle(x)$ can be written as

$$\Phi^\triangle(x) = \Phi^\triangle\big(\alpha_1 u+\alpha_2 v+\alpha_3 w\big) = \alpha_1\Phi^K(u)+\alpha_2\Phi^K(u)+\alpha_3\Phi^K(u). \tag{6.61}$$

Invoking (6.60), we thus get

$$\mathrm{Var}\big(\Phi^\triangle(x)\big) \ge \big(g\log K - c\big)(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_3)^2 = g\log K - c. \tag{6.62}$$

This is exactly the desired bound (6.53). □

7. CONFORMAL INVARIANCE

The last item left to prove is the conformal-transformation rule from Theorem 2.5. We begin by a simple consequence of Theorem 6.1. Recall that a rotation is a map $f\colon \mathbb{C}\to\mathbb{C}$ of the form $f(z)=\lambda z$ for $\lambda\in\mathbb{C}$ with $|\lambda|=1$.

Lemma 7.1 *The family of laws of $\{Z^D\colon D\in\mathfrak{D}\}$ is invariant under rotations. More precisely, if $f(z)=\lambda z$ for some $|\lambda|=1$, then for all $D\in\mathfrak{D}$,*

$$(Z^{f(D)}\circ f)\,(\mathrm{d}x)\overset{\text{law}}{=}Z^D(\mathrm{d}x). \tag{7.1}$$

Proof. As observed already in the proof of Theorem 2.8, the family $\{Z^D\colon D\in\mathfrak{D}\}$ obeys conditions (0-4) thereof and so, by Theorem 6.1, Z^D is a weak limit of the measures in (6.4). Thanks to the representation based on Poisson kernel and Euclidean distance, the function ψ^D is clearly invariant under rotations of D and so is the covariance $C^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ of the field $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$, provided we rotate the underlying triangular grid — which determines $\widetilde{D}$ from D — along with D. It follows that also the law of the measure in (6.4) is rotation invariant and thus so must be Z^D. □

We will now state general conditions on a family of random measures that ensures validity of the conformal-transformation rule (2.10).

Theorem 7.2 *Suppose $\{M^D\colon D\in\mathfrak{D}\}$ is a family of random Borel measures that obey:*

(0) *(support and total mass restriction) M^D is concentrated on D and $M^D(D)<\infty$ a.s.*

(1) *(stochastic absolute continuity) $P(M^D(A)>0)=0$ for any Borel $A\subset D$ with $\mathrm{Leb}(A)=0$,*

(2) *(shift, dilation and rotation invariance) for $a,\lambda\in\mathbb{C}$,*

$$M^{a+\lambda D}(a+\lambda\,\mathrm{d}x)\overset{\text{law}}{=}|\lambda|^4M^D(\mathrm{d}x), \tag{7.2}$$

(3) *(Gibbs-Markov property) if $D,\widetilde{D}\in\mathfrak{D}$ are disjoint then, for M^D and $M^{\widetilde{D}}$ on the right are regarded as independent,*

$$M^{D\cup\widetilde{D}}(\mathrm{d}x)\overset{\text{law}}{=}M^D(\mathrm{d}x)+M^{\widetilde{D}}(\mathrm{d}x), \tag{7.3}$$

while if $D,\widetilde{D}\in\mathfrak{D}$ obey $\widetilde{D}\subseteq D$ and $\mathrm{Leb}(D\smallsetminus\widetilde{D})=0$, then

$$M^D(\mathrm{d}x)\overset{\text{law}}{=}M^{\widetilde{D}}(\mathrm{d}x)\,\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x)}, \tag{7.4}$$

where $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ and $M^{\widetilde{D}}$ on the right-hand side are independent.

Then for any conformal bijection $f\colon D\to D'$ with $D,D'\in\mathfrak{D}$

$$(M^{D'}\circ f)(\mathrm{d}x)\overset{\text{law}}{=}|f'(x)|^4M^D(\mathrm{d}x). \tag{7.5}$$

We can apply this result immediately to the family of measures constructed in Theorem 2.1:

Proof of Theorem 2.5. By Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 7.1, the family of measures $\{Z^D\colon D\in\mathfrak{D}\}$ obeys the conditions of Theorem 7.2 and so we get (2.10) from (7.5). The relation (2.11) is then a consequence of the fact that, for any conformal bijection $f\colon D\to\widetilde{D}$ between simply connected domains D and D', we have $|f'(x)|=\mathrm{rad}_{\widetilde{D}}(f(x))/\mathrm{rad}_D(x)$. □

The upshot of Theorem 7.2 is that the Gibbs-Markov property is sufficient to turn invariance under "rigid" conformal maps — shifts, rotations and dilations — into invariance under all conformal maps. This is no big surprise as general conformal maps can be thought of as shifts, rotations and dilations locally. However, full details still require some work. Fortunately, a good part of this work has already been done in Propositions 6.3–6.5 in Section 6.

The crux of the proof will be to show the following one-way bound:

Proposition 7.3 *Let $\{M^D : D \in \mathfrak{D}\}$ be as in Theorem 7.2. Pick $D, D' \in \mathfrak{D}$ and let $f : D \to D'$ be a conformal bijection. Then for any bounded and continuous function $u : D' \to [0,\infty)$,*

$$E\big(\mathrm{e}^{-M^D(u\circ f)}\big) \geq E\big(\mathrm{e}^{-M^{D'}(u|f'\circ f^{-1}|^{-4})}\big). \tag{7.6}$$

Indeed, this is more than enough to give us the desired result:

Proof of Theorem 7.2. Just iterate (7.6) twice to see that equality must hold for all bounded and continuous u. □

To get Proposition 7.3, we begin with the observation that the law of the "binding" field $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ is invariant under conformal maps. More precisely, we have:

Lemma 7.4 *Let $D, \widetilde{D} \in \mathfrak{D}$ obey $\widetilde{D} \subseteq D$. Let f be a conformal bijection of D onto $f(D) \in \mathfrak{D}$. Then we have*

$$C^{D,\widetilde{D}}(x,y) = C^{f(D),f(\widetilde{D})}\big(f(x),f(y)\big), \qquad x,y \in \widetilde{D}. \tag{7.7}$$

In particular, $\Phi^{f(D),f(\widetilde{D})} \circ f \overset{\text{law}}{=} \Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$.

Proof. By (3.19), $C^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ is the difference of the Green functions in D and $\widetilde{D}$. The claim then follows from the fact that $G^{f(D)}(f(x),f(y)) = G^D(x,y)$ for any $x,y \in D$. (This is itself proved, e.g., by noting that $y \mapsto G^D(x,y)$ is a fundamental solution of the Poisson equation in D, i.e., it solves the equation $\Delta\varphi(y) = \delta_x(y)$ in D with zero boundary conditions on ∂D. Under f, this equation transforms to the corresponding equation in $f(D)$.) □

Proof of Proposition 7.3. Let $D \in \mathfrak{D}$ and let $\widetilde{D}$ be the union of triangles of side K^{-1} as detailed in Section 6.1. Then, as observed before, the measure $M^D_{K,R,\delta}$ defined in (6.11) tends, in the limit $K \to \infty$, $R \to \infty$ and $\delta \downarrow 0$, to M^D. Suppose now that $f : D \to D'$ is a conformal bijection of D onto a domain $D' \in \mathfrak{D}$ and pick a test function $u : D' \to [0,\infty)$ which we assume to be bounded and continuous. The composition $u \circ f$ induces a corresponding test function on D. Then

$$M^D_{K,R,\delta}(u\circ f) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_K} 1_{A^i_{K,R}} M^{D^i}\big((u\circ f)\,1_{D^i_\delta}\,\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}}\big). \tag{7.8}$$

Define

$$f_{i,K}(z) := f(x^i_0) + (1+K^{-1/2})f'(x^i_0)(z-x^i_0) \tag{7.9}$$

and note that this is a slightly scaled-up linearization of f on D^i. Using the inverse of this function to change variables from $z \in D$ to $z \in D'$ we get

$$M^D_{K,R,\delta}(u\circ f) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_K} 1_{A^i_{K,R}} M^{D^i} \circ f^{-1}_{i,K}\Big((u\circ f\circ f^{-1}_{i,K})\,(1_{D^i_\delta}\circ f^{-1}_{i,K})\,\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}\circ f^{-1}_{i,K}}\Big). \tag{7.10}$$

But the fact that D^i are at least δ away from the boundary of D implies a uniform bound on f'' there and, as a consequence, the estimate

$$f - f_{i,K} = O(K^{-3/2}), \qquad \text{on } D^i, \tag{7.11}$$

with the implicit constant uniform in $i = 1,\dots,n_K$. For any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, the following is true as soon as K is sufficiently large and $c \in (0,\infty)$ is a constant independent of K:

(a) $f_{i,K}(D^i) \supseteq f(D^i)$,

(b) for $\widetilde{D}^i_\delta := \{z \in f(D^i)\colon \operatorname{dist}(z, f(D^i)^{\mathrm{c}}) > (\delta/2)|f'(x^i_0)|/K\}$,

$$1_{D^i_\delta} \circ f^{-1}_{i,K} \le 1_{\widetilde{D}^i_\delta}, \tag{7.12}$$

(c) whenever $A^i_{K,R}$ occurs,

$$\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}\circ f^{-1}_{i,K}} \le \mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}\circ f^{-1} + cK^{-3/2}}, \qquad \text{on } \widetilde{D}^i_\delta, \tag{7.13}$$

(d) on $f(D^i)$,

$$u \circ f \circ f^{-1}_{i,K} \le u + \varepsilon. \tag{7.14}$$

(e) for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and K sufficiently large,

$$\mathrm{e}^{\frac12\alpha^2\mathrm{Var}(\Phi^{f_{i,K}(D^i),f(D^i)}(x))} \le 1+\varepsilon \tag{7.15}$$

holds for all $x \in D^i_\delta$.

Here (a-b) are consequences of the definition of $f_{i,K}$, (c) uses (7.11) the restriction on Lipschitz property of $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$ imposed by event $A^i_{K,R}$ while (d) is in turn based on the uniform continuity of the test function u. To get (e) we again invoke the "closeness" of domains $f_{i,K}(D^i)$ and $f(D^i)$ along with the invariance under scaling of both domains and Proposition 3.7.

Invoking (b-d) in (7.10) gives

$$M^D_{K,R,\delta}(u\circ f) \le \mathrm{e}^{cK^{-1/2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_K} 1_{A^i_{K,R}} (M^{D^i}\circ f^{-1}_{i,K})\Bigl((u+\varepsilon)\, 1_{\widetilde{D}^i_\delta}\, \mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}\circ f^{-1}}\Bigr) \tag{7.16}$$

while assumptions (2-3) of Theorem 7.2 imply

$$(M^{D^i}\circ f^{-1}_{i,K})(w) \overset{\text{law}}{=} |f'(x^i_0)|^{-4} M^{f(D^i)}\bigl(w\,\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{f_{i,K}(D^i),f(D^i)}}\bigr) \tag{7.17}$$

for any measurable function $w\colon f_{i,K}(D^i) \to [0,\infty)$ with $\operatorname{supp}(w) \subseteq f(D^i)$. (Here $\Phi^{f_{i,K}(D^i),f(D^i)}$ is independent of $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$.) Using this inside the Laplace transform and applying Jensen's inequality, we get the estimate

$$E\bigl(\mathrm{e}^{-(M^{D^i}\circ f^{-1}_{i,K})(w)}\bigr) \ge E\biggl(\exp\Bigl\{-|f'(x^i_0)|^{-4} M^{f(D^i)}\bigl(w\,\mathrm{e}^{\frac12\alpha^2\mathrm{Var}(\Phi^{f_{i,K}(D^i),f(D^i)})}\bigr)\Bigr\}\biggr). \tag{7.18}$$

Now we are ready to put bits and pieces together. First, since $\{M^{D^i}\colon i = 1,\dots,n_K\}$ are independent, and all of them are independent of $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$, (7.16), (7.18) and (7.15) yield

$$\begin{aligned} &E\bigl(\mathrm{e}^{-M^D_{K,R,\delta}(u\circ f)}\bigr) \\ &\quad\ge E\biggl(\exp\Bigl\{-\mathrm{e}^{cK^{-1/2}}(1+\varepsilon)\sum_{i=1}^{n_K} M^{f(D^i)}\bigl((u+\varepsilon)(|f'\circ f^{-1}|)^{-4}+\varepsilon\bigr)\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}\circ f^{-1}}\bigr)\Bigr\}\biggr), \end{aligned} \tag{7.19}$$

where we regard $\{M^{f(D^i)}\colon i=1,\dots,n_K\}$ as independent and independent of $\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}$. Notice that we also bounded $|f'(x_0^i)|^{-4}\le|(f'\circ f^{-1})(x)|^{-4}+\varepsilon$ for all $x\in f(D^i)$ and dropped the indicators of events $A^i_{K,R}$ and sets $\widetilde{D}^i_\delta$. But Lemma 7.1 implies that

$$\Phi^{D,\widetilde{D}}\circ f^{-1}\overset{\text{law}}{=}\Phi^{D',\widetilde{D}'} \tag{7.20}$$

and so the Gibbs-Markov property yields

$$E\bigl(\mathrm{e}^{-M^D_{K,R,\delta}(u\circ f)}\bigr)\ge E\bigl(\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{e}^{cK^{-1/2}}(1+\varepsilon)M^{D'}((u+\varepsilon)(|f'\circ f^{-1}|^{-4}+\varepsilon))}\bigr). \tag{7.21}$$

Taking $K\to\infty$, $\varepsilon\downarrow 0$, $R\to\infty$ and $\delta\downarrow 0$ (in this order) then gives the claim. □

APPENDIX: CONVERGENCE OF HARMONIC MEASURES

The purpose of this section is to prove that the harmonic measure converges as the underlying domain (discrete or continuous) approaches a limit set $D\in\mathfrak{D}$. We begin with the harder of the two statements; namely, the one dealing with convergence of the discrete harmonic measure H^D_N to its continuous counterpart Π^D:

Lemma A.1 *For any $D\in\mathfrak{D}$ and any bounded continuous $f\colon\mathbb{C}\to\mathbb{R}$,*

$$\sum_{z\in\partial D_N}H^D_N\bigl(\lfloor xN\rfloor,z\bigr)\,f(z/N)\underset{N\to\infty}{\longrightarrow}\int_{\partial D}\Pi^D(x,\mathrm{d}z)f(z) \tag{A.1}$$

uniformly as x varies over closed subsets of D.

Before we give a proof, let us note that results of this kind (of course) exist in the literature. For instance, Lawler and Limić [31, Proposition 7.3.3] discuss this for a specific class of simply connected domains (in general dimension). Two dimensional cases have also been treated, e.g., in the recent work of Chelkak and Smirnov [18] but these apply only to monotone sequences of domains with the boundary of the limit domain composed of a finite number of Jordan arcs (Proposition 3.3 [18]) or arbitrary sequences of simply connected domains converging in Carathéodory sense (Theorem 3.12 of [18]). However, none of these settings include our class of domains and so we provide a probabilistic proof here. Our argument is akin to that in [31] albeit quite special to two dimensions. It is here where the assumption on the number and the diameter of the connected components of ∂D plays an important role.

Proof of Lemma A.1. It is obvious that one can take subsequential limits and that they would all be concentrated on ∂D, so the key issue is to identify the limit with the harmonic measure in the continuum domain. We will do this by a coupling argument.

Pick $x\in D$ and let $B=\{B_t\colon t\ge 0\}$ be a standard Brownian motion started from x. Consider the simple random walk $X=\{X_n\colon n\ge 0\}$ on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ started from $\lfloor xN\rfloor$. Let $T_R:=\inf\{t\ge 0\colon|B_t|\ge R\}$. By Donsker's Theorem, for each $N\ge 1$ there exists a coupling $P_{N,x}$ of the two processes on the same probability space such that, for each $r>0$ and each $R>0$, uniformly in $x\in D$,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}P_{N,x}\Bigl(\sup_{0\le t\le T_R}|B_t-N^{-1}X_{\lfloor tN^2\rfloor}|>r\Bigr)=0. \tag{A.2}$$

The key is to show that the exit point of B from D is with high probability close to the exit point (scaled by N^{-1}) of X from D_N. Specifically, setting

$$\tau:=\inf\{t\ge 0\colon B_t\notin D\} \tag{A.3}$$

and

$$\hat\tau := \inf\{n \ge 1 \colon X_n \notin D_N\}, \tag{A.4}$$

it suffices to show that $B_\tau - N^{-1}X_{\hat\tau}$ is small with high probability.

We begin by some general considerations about behavior of Brownian paths. Pick $r > 0$ and consider the figure-eight domain

$$A_r(x) := \bigl\{z \in \mathbb{C} \colon 3r < |x-z-2r| < 4r\bigr\} \cup \bigl\{z \in \mathbb{C} \colon 3r < |x-z+2r| < 4r\bigr\}. \tag{A.5}$$

Let $\gamma := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \colon |x-z \pm 2r| = \frac{7}{2}r\}$ be the center curve in $A_r(x)$ and let $G_r(x)$ be the event that the Brownian motion hits γ in $A_r(x) \cap \{z \in \mathbb{C} \colon r < |z-x| < 2r\}$ and, between this time and the first exit time from $A_r(x)$ does the following: it runs a complete "circle" around one of the annuli until it hits its path again, and then enters the other of the two annuli and runs a complete "circle" around it until it hits itself again.

It is a fact that the probability of $G_r(x)$ is positive and, thanks to recurrence and scale invariance of B, this probability is independent of r as well as of the starting point of the Brownian motion. By the Strong Markov Property, for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $K \ge 1$ such that $\bigcup_{m=1}^K G_{4^m r}(x)$ occurs with probability at least $1-\varepsilon$ for all $r > 0$ and all x. A key observation is that, due to the construction, on $G_r(x)$ intersected with the event in (A.2) with $R > 4r$, both the Brownian motion B and the scaled random walk $\widetilde X_t := N^{-1}X_{\lfloor tN^2 \rfloor}$ complete a loop around the disc $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \colon |z-x| < r\}$.

Let $\delta > 0$ be smaller than the diameters of all connected components of ∂D and, given $\varepsilon > 0$ and $K \ge 1$ as above, pick $r > 0$ so that $4^K r + r < \delta$. Let D^r be as in (3.21) with δ replaced by r and set

$$\tau_r := \inf\{t \ge 0 \colon B_t \notin D^r\}. \tag{A.6}$$

By the Strong Markov property for the Brownian motion we know that

$$P_{N,x}\Bigl(\bigcup_{m=1}^K G_{4^m r}(B_{\tau_r}) \text{ occurs for } B_{\tau_r+\cdot}\Bigr) \ge 1-\varepsilon \tag{A.7}$$

uniformly in $N \ge 1$ and x compact subsets of D^r. Since our constructions guarantee that some connected component of ∂D "crosses" $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \colon r < |z-B_{\tau_r}| < 4^K r\}$, on the event in (A.7) we have $|B_\tau - B_{\tau_r}| < \delta$. Assuming that the event in (A.2) occurs for some $R > \delta$, in light of our assumptions (2.1–2.2) on D_N also X must hit ∂D_N within $N\delta$ of NB_τ. It follows that

$$\liminf_{N\to\infty} P_{N,x}\bigl(|B_\tau - N^{-1}X_{\hat\tau_0}| < 2\delta\bigr) > 1-\varepsilon, \tag{A.8}$$

uniformly in x over compact subsets of D^r. As ε and δ were arbitrary (just small enough), this yields the claim. □

The second approximation statement concerns continuum domains. Since we are dealing with monotone sequences, we could perhaps appeal to the Perron construction of solutions to the Dirichlet problem. (We thank John Garnett for making this point to us.) However, a direct probabilistic argument works just as well:

Lemma A.2 *Given $D \in \mathfrak{D}$, let D^δ be as in* (3.21)*. Then for any bounded continuous $f \colon \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\int_{\partial D^\delta} \Pi^{D^\delta}(x, \mathrm{d}z) f(z) \underset{\delta\downarrow 0}{\longrightarrow} \int_{\partial D} \Pi^D(x, \mathrm{d}z) f(z) \tag{A.9}$$

uniformly as x varies over closed subsets of D.

Proof (sketch). The proof uses the same argument as that of Lemma A.1 except that the coupling is now trivial (both processes are standard Brownian motions). The construction in the above proof guarantees that, after exiting D^r, with probability at least $1-\varepsilon$, the Brownian motion will hit a component of ∂D within distance $4^K r + r$. As K is fixed and $r \downarrow 0$, the claim follows. □

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research has been partially supported by European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013]) under the grant agreement number 276923-MC–MOTIPROX, and also by NSF grant DMS-1407558 and GAČR project P201/11/1558. Part of this work was carried out when the authors visited the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences in Kyoto University.

REFERENCES

[1] R.J. Adler (1990). *An introduction to continuity, extrema, and related topics for general Gaussian processes*. Institute of Mathematical Statistics Lecture Notes–Monograph Series, vol. 12. Institute of Mathematical Statistics, Hayward, CA, x+160 pp.

[2] E. Aïdékon, J. Berestycki, E. Brunet and Z. Shi (2013). The branching Brownian motion seen from its tip. *Probab. Theory Rel. Fields* **157**, no. 1–2, 405–451.

[3] R. Allez, R. Rhodes and V. Vargas (2013). Lognormal $\star$-scale invariant random measures. *Probab. Theory Rel. Fields* **155**, no. 3-4, 751–788.

[4] L.-P. Arguin, A. Bovier, and N. Kistler (2011). Genealogy of extremal particles of branching brownian motion. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* **64**, 1647–1676.

[5] L.-P. Arguin, A. Bovier, and N. Kistler (2013). Poissonian statistics in the extremal process of branching brownian motion. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* (to appear) arXiv:1010.2376.

[6] L.-P. Arguin, A. Bovier, and N. Kistler (2011). The extremal process of branching Brownian motion. *Probab. Theory Rel. Fields* **157**, no. 3–4, 535–574.

[7] L.-P. Arguin and O. Zindy (2012). Poisson-Dirichlet Statistics for the extremes of a log-correlated Gaussian field. arXiv:1203.4216

[8] J. Barral, A. Kupiainen, M. Nikula, E. Saksman, C. Webb (2014). Basic properties of critical lognormal multiplicative chaos. *Ann. Probab.* (to appear).

[9] M. Biskup and O. Louidor (2013). Extreme local extrema of two-dimensional discrete Gaussian free field. arXiv:1306.2602

[10] M. Biskup and O. Louidor (2014). Full extremal process of two-dimensional discrete Gaussian free field. In preparation.

[11] E. Bolthausen, J.-D. Deuschel and G. Giacomin (2001). Entropic repulsion and the maximum of the two-dimensional harmonic crystal. *Ann. Probab.* **29**, no. 4, 1670–1692.

[12] E. Bolthausen, J.-D. Deuschel, and O. Zeitouni (2011). Recursions and tightness for the maximum of the discrete, two dimensional gaussian free field. *Elect. Commun. Probab.* **16**, 114–119.

[13] A. Bovier (2014). *From spin glasses to branching Brownian motion — and back?* Lecture notes for 2013 Prague Summer School on Mathematical Statistical Physics. (to appear)

[14] M. Bramson (1978). Maximal displacement of branching Brownian motion. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* **31**, no. 5, 531-581.

[15] M. Bramson (1983). Convergence of solutions of the Kolmogorov equation to traveling waves. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **44**, no. 285, iv+190.

[16] M. Bramson, J. Ding and O. Zeitouni (2013). Convergence in law of the maximum of the two-dimensional discrete Gaussian free field. arXiv:1301.6669

[17] M. Bramson and O. Zeitouni (2011). Tightness of the recentered maximum of the two-dimensional discrete Gaussian free field. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **65**, 1–20.

[18] D. Chelkak and S. Smirnov (2011). Discrete complex analysis on isoradial graphs. *Adv. Math.* **228** 1590–1630.

[19] A. Dembo, Y. Peres, J. Rosen, and O. Zeitouni (2004). Cover times for Brownian motion and random walks in two dimensions. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **160**, 433–464.
[20] J. Ding (2012). On cover times for 2D lattices. *Electron. J. Probab.* **17**, no. 45, 1–18.
[21] J. Ding (2013). Exponential and double exponential tails for maximum of two-dimensional discrete Gaussian free field. *Probab. Theory Rel. Fields* **157**, no. 1–2, 285–299.
[22] J. Ding, J. Lee and Y. Peres (2012). Cover times, blanket times, and majorizing measures. *Ann. Math.* **175**, no. 3, 1409–1471.
[23] J. Ding and O. Zeitouni (2014). Extreme values for two-dimensional discrete Gaussian free field. *Ann. Probab.* **42**, no. 4, 1480–1515
[24] B. Duplantier, R. Rhodes, S. Sheffield and V. Vargas (2012). Critical Gaussian multiplicative chaos: Convergence of the derivative martingale. arXiv:1206.1671
[25] B. Duplantier, R. Rhodes, S. Sheffield and V. Vargas (2012). Renormalization of critical Gaussian multiplicative chaos and KPZ formula. arXiv:1212.0529
[26] E.B. Dynkin (1984). Gaussian and non-Gaussian random fields associated with Markov processes. *J. Funct. Anal.* **55**, no. 3, 344–376.
[27] J.-P. Kahane (1985). Sur le chaos multiplicatif. *Ann. Sci. Math. Québec* **9**, no.2, 105–150.
[28] G. Kozma and E. Schreiber (2004). An asymptotic expansion for the discrete harmonic potential. *Electron. J. Probab.* **9**, Paper no. 1, pages 10–17.
[29] S.P. Lalley and T. Sellke (1987). A conditional limit theorem for the frontier of a branching Brownian motion. *Ann. Probab.* **15**, no. 3, 1052–1061.
[30] G.F. Lawler (1991). *Intersections of Random Walks*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA.
[31] G.F. Lawler and V. Limic (2010). *Random walk: a modern introduction*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 123. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, xii+364.
[32] Y. Le Jan (2011). *Markov Paths, Loops and Fields*. École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XXXVII-2008. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag.
[33] T. Madaule (2013). Maximum of a log-correlated Gaussian field. arXiv:1307.1365.
[34] H.P. McKean (1975). Application of Brownian motion to the equation of Kolmogorov-Petrovskii-Piskunov. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **28** 323–331.
[35] R. Rhodes and V. Vargas (2013). Gaussian multiplicative chaos and applications: a review. arXiv:1305.6221
[36] R. Robert and V. Vargas (2010). Gaussian multiplicative chaos revisited. *Ann. Probab.* **38**, no. 2, 605–631.
[37] S. Sheffield (2007). Gaussian free fields for mathematicians. *Probab. Theory Rel. Fields* **139**, no. 3–4, 521–541.
[38] A.-S. Sznitman (2012). *Topics in Occupation Times and Gaussian Free Fields*. Zürich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics, vol 16, European Math. Soc., 122 pp.